THE RECORDER:

BEING A COLLECTION OF

Tracts and Disquisitions,

CHIEFLY RELATIVE TO THE

MODERN STATE AND PRINCIPLES

OF

THE PEOPLE CALLED

QUAKERS.

VOL. I.

BY

WILLIAM MATTHEWS,

OF BATH.

Thoroughly Wicleyite

Gather up the Fragments which remain, that nothing be lost.
John vi. 12.

Happy is the Man that findeth Wisdom, and the Man that getteth Understanding. *Prov.* iii 13.

BATH,

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY R. CRUTTWELL;

PUBLISHED BY

J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON;

AND SOLD BY ALL THE BOOKSELLERS.

1802.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE.

WHOEVER shall have passed many years in habits of reflection on religious subjects, and have felt himself warmly interested in the principles of his education, will best account for my chief inducement to the publication of this work. To some among my old associates in religious connection the *necessity* of it may not be obvious, and the *propriety* may not be readily assented to: others again may have different opinions about the series of selection. But, on the whole, I have used what appeared to me a liberty suitable to the present state of the Society, and consistent with an independent choice.

The rise, progress, and principles of *Friends* have been amply detailed by several able writers in different periods, and their labours, long before the publick, are sufficient evidence that we have wanted neither care nor ability to give that publick very general information. The respectability which has consequently attached to the Society, has been very considerable—and with every allowance for human imperfection, the Society of Friends has not failed to be con-

sidered with advantage, in the religious world: But the state of all societies varies with the progress of time, and consequent remarks upon them are ever allowable.

It is natural for contemplative men to feel a strong partiality for the best parts of that religious system in which they have been exercised, and in those occurrences which have fallen under their own observation. I am one who profess to have felt, and still to feel, the force of such an early predilection. As the period of human life is short and uncertain, I feel a powerful motive to arrange and record, under the foregoing title, certain tracts and transactions in which I have either borne a part, or which may be so connected as to illustrate the complexion of that period of Quakerism, in which my lot has been cast. The work, from its leading title, and from its nature, may possibly form the commencement of a succession of volumes, of a similar kind; volumes which, if not continued by the same hand, may be extended by others from period to period, as an amusive and perhaps not an unedifying repository. One chief feature of our Society, from its beginning, has been that of a refusal actively to pay "tithes, priests' de-"mands, and those called church-rates." This peculiar scruple, which the Society has agreed to call a testimony, has been the cause of much personal suffering at former periods; but as it has long, in some degree or other, had its *dissentients*, it has been productive of continual breaches of harmony. It happened, as will

appear at some length, to be one of those topics, on which I was obliged to think differently from many of my brethren: Not that I ever thought less than they, that the tithe institution was incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel ministry. In that, and in the strongest objection against *war*, and of course against taxes to support it, I have not been a whit behind the chiefest of them in the reality of my testimony. But in my ideas of the proper and consistent use of that testimony, I have reluctantly been obliged to differ from the publick professions and distinctions of the body. So circumstanced, I could not act the part of an insincere conformist; I could not satisfactorily be silent on the subject of my dissent. This, it will be supposed by others, as it is known to my acquaintance, occasioned me first an unquiet, and then a detached situation. But after an intervention of many years, the bond of love and good-will towards the general body, as towards numerous individuals of it, remains unbroken. We "love as brethren" still; and what I deem the *main* principles of Christianity, as held by our ancient Friends, are principles which I cherish and revere.

After these remarks, it will, perhaps, appear natural that I should commence this volume with a performance which struck at the literary labours of the chief Society-writer of my early life, and to whose pursuits my attention had been drawn. Having sincerely approved the tenor of that pamphlet, and been induced to make some additions to it, as will be found explained, it may

now be considered as very much my own; but its admonitory aid is always at the reader's service. The writer above alluded to will readily be perceived by my friends to be the late JOSEPH PHIPPS—a sensible and worthy man; and though he was narrow and rather bigotted in some of his sentiments, under the head of *faith*, and some of his arguments were of course the weaker, I never doubted his sincerity: and I trust he is removed to the divine acceptance of his Maker. Often have I regretted, when I considered his general character, that he and I could not think as truly alike on *all* subjects, as we certainly did on *many*. And if this was my regret concerning an individual, what must it not have been, what must it not remain to be, respecting many more now living, equally worthy of my esteem? But so the case stands—and nothing but the pleasing hopes of a more harmonious and happy state can balance the infelicity. The introduction of the other pieces in the collection has been successively explained.

Of late years we have seen *another* writer, gradually coming forward as the successor of the deceased, but with the assertion of *other* principles: Principles which he seems to think necessary to be *fixed* on the Society; to be avowed and held forth as the essential faith of Friends; and without a kind of *subscription* to which, he would persuade us there can be no soundness of Christianity! How far the specimens we have had of his doctrines, and manner of enforcing them, indicate his value, as

a leader in the Society, will soon become generally judged of. It will appear from some of my free remarks on the *reasoning* and *conduct* of this writer, that I am not of the number who can think very favourably of their spirit and tendency. The manner in which he has taken an active part, on recent occasions, has not, according to my apprehension, redounded to his credit as a religious character: of course, I conceive he cannot be expected to benefit, as his abilities ought to do, the chief interests of the Society. Should he continue to make similar efforts, and to manifest a similar spirit, it is probable he will not pass without that degree of publick attention to his movements which may be proper. Of two or three others, who have lately come forward on the same side, as authors of small pamphlets of bigotry or abuse, little need at present be said. The productions, especially those of *one* new adventurer, against *Arianism*, *Semi Arianism*, *Deism*, and *Schismaticks*, are too much like the sallies of knight-errantry to be treated seriously. Indeed, the giving of any sanction to such weak and incongruous effusions, will not be expected of the Society—till it shall have lost much more of its character for sobriety and common sense. But any proper performance, on behalf of the Society, or of Christianity at large, was not to be expected from a man who had got so strange a notion of his own consequence, as rather to think himself *divinely* appointed as a writer.—This notion does not appear so fully in his wri-

tings, as in a letter of his, which I have seen, concerning them. He therein avows this sentiment, that "If he be authorised to use *the* "*sword of the* LORD *and of Gideon*, he wishes "not to return it to its scabbard, till he shall "have slain all the LORD's enemies."—After this any thing!

It will appear, on perusal of the following Tracts, that the subjects which of late have chiefly occupied the attention of a part of the Society, have been of a nature rather new, or at least newly revived: And that the too common propensity in religious bodies, sometimes as among themselves, and sometimes respecting professors in other connections, has crept in among Friends—I mean the disposition to disparage character, by imputing dangerous errors, and calling odious names. Some writers of great literary eminence, either through inattention or from worse causes, had not been wanting to class the whole Society of Friends as *Deists*, or disbelievers in the authority of written revelation. The error of this imputation is certainly great, and a candid perusal of the chief early writers among the Friends, must clearly prove it so. No people more certainly profess to believe the Divine authority of the doctrines of the New Testament (abating for some particular obscurities and interpolations) than do the Friends. No people lay more strong and earnest claim than they to the particular authorities and privileges revealed in those records. Their almost peculiar belief of the Divine assistance, by immediate in-

spiration, for religious offices in the Christian church, &c. they found on the solemn reality of written revelation: and in vindication of their principles they continually refer to it. They may be said to differ, as they certainly have always done, from various other Christian professors, in their construction of *some parts* of written revelation; and they have largely stated wherein. But it seems to have been reserved to the present times for the Friends to exemplify a large degree of intolerance, and of readiness for persecution among themselves, respecting mysterious points, unessential to practical religion;—and still further, to imitate some of their adversaries, in the reproachful imputation of *Deism* and *Infidelity!*

The mysterious subject of the personal nature or mode of existence in the Deity, the Friends were never wont to agitate in a sectarian spirit: they were never, till of late, in the habit of attempting to inforce church mysteries, or to prescribe senses for each other's belief therein. This they formerly avoided, because they were not commanded, directly or indirectly, to be so employed. And they were duly persuaded, that as definitions of the divine *essential nature of* GOD were unrevealed in scripture, or in their own minds, they were mysteries too high for scrutiny; and that the ALMIGHTY was incomprehensible. They found it largely testified throughout the scriptures, that HE is *one* GOD, of glorious and infinite perfections; and they found it their solemn duty *so* to acknowledge and adore him. They

largely read in the same sacred writings, of the character and offices of *Jesus Christ*—supereminently the *Son of God:* and with the scripture accounts of his dignity they appear to have been generally satisfied. They found abundant evidence of his *divine* character, and that his doctrines were proclaimed as a dispensation from Heaven; that they breathed, without mixture, the pure, beneficent, heavenly spirit, which was to them full evidence of Divine authority. This they reverently received, and to its excellence aspired to conform their lives. They also regarded the Lord Jesus as the holy anointed high priest of the universal church—the constantly abiding teacher, by his special presence in the hearts of men, and this according to his own recorded testimony of himself. They acknowledged him as the appointed Redeemer and Saviour of the world. In fine, they professed to believe concerning the *Son of God*, just as He himself had taught them to believe. But they added and laid down no terms of ambiguous indispensible orthodoxy, by which the faith of their brethren was to be proved, justified, and condemned. It seems to have been sufficient among our forefathers, that *all* acknowledged the power and purity of the Christian life, and so endeavoured to stand in the heavenly bond of discipleship. This was their general character; to the credit at once of their religion, and of their understanding. And so far as a few individuals among them have attempted, occasionally, to explain the mysteries of Divine essence

and personality, or to lay down articles of faith relative to such topics, they have added to difficulty, and increased the evidence of uncertainty.

It has become a new refinement, or perversion, of modern zealots among the Friends, to encourage *abstruse* questions, after the manner of other innovators on Christian simplicity, respecting the essence and mode of existence in the Godhead:—With this, also, to have connected the *supreme Divinity of Christ*, as co-essential and co-equal with the Father; and also that the Son, in some sense or other, is very and eternal GOD! It is, indeed, to a certain degree, true, that such notions of compound eternal existence, in the adorable Supreme, cannot be absolutely *disproved* by the powers of the human mind; because those powers are inadequate to a demonstration of any mode whatever of infinite eternal existence. But such inadequacy cannot be a sanction for the most unsupported and extravagant opinions; or warrant the arrogance of arbitrary tenets, of human device, prescribed and enforced under penalties of condemnation! The *incapacity* of finite beings was not intended to exalt itself into such a sphere of clouded eminence—such a province of blind infallibility! There are positive degrees of ignorance which must ever rest on the counsels and apprehensions of human creatures; and whereinsoever Divine revelation has been silent, it is the positive duty of man, under all his various imbecility, to be silent also. Or if he agitate any mysterious and transcendent subjects, while he believes *the scriptures* (especially those

of the New Testament) to be a Divine rule concerning them, it becomes his bounden duty to receive and govern his principles according to the positive tenor of *their* testimony. If this rule be admitted, (and to this rule we must be allowed to call and conjure attention) we shall see abundant evidence of the *presumption* of some of our imperious and would-be orthodox brethren. On that evidence we may securely rest our right of objection to their arrogance, in the articles of the supreme eternal Divinity of Christ, and the *triune* existence of the *Godhead*. On that evidence I desire to rest the solution of such questions, so far forth as they may *allowably* be made questions, connected with essential soundness in Christian faith.

The reader will find, in the latter part of this volume, such arrangementts of doctrine, to the points in controversy, as I trust may bid defiance to all random assertions: Such a weight of sacred testimony, as must bear down all the notional irreverent cavils, of all opposers of the simple unity of GOD—the supreme adorable Father of the universe.

It is wonderful that so many persons should be found, in different Societies, and especially that any should be found among Friends, professing to reverence the spirit and tenor of scripture, but who yet can have read to so little purpose! Who, instead of regarding the general scope of scripture evidence, as to the doctrines in question, have seemed not to perceive the

most plain, re-iterated, and solemn distinctions of the whole New Testament.

But though I despair of being instrumental to convince *some* persons among our brethren, of their palpable errors in point of Christian faith, and of their unwarrantable conduct under those errors; I am encouraged to hope my labours will not be lost on others. To the candid, enquiring, and serious *youth*, of both sexes, I more particularly address this work—and may the Divine blessing be attendant on their sober enquiries and devoutest meditations!

W. M.

BATH, 1802.

OF

CHURCH DISCIPLINE, &c.

Sect. 1. AFTER the Apostles of Christ had gathered many and great churches, both from among the Jews and Gentiles, they were solicitous, that the Believers [a] *might walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they were called;* and as they had named the name of Christ might [b] *depart from iniquity,* and be careful to [c] *give none offence,* (might in no respect bring a *scandal* on their holy profession,) *neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God.*

§. 2. AND to prevent their falling back into [d] *their former lusts, in their ignorance; and turning the grace of God into wantonness;* they did not only give them the warmest exhortations both in publick and private, but introduced a *discipline,* in which the Church in general were engaged to bear a part, and wherein they proceeded diversely, according to the nature of cases.

§. 3. IF it was private and personal wrong, our Lord himself directed, that the delinquents should be dealt with in private. [e] *If thy brother shall* trespass *against thee, go tell him his fault between him and thee alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more; and if*

[a] Eph. iv. 1. [b] 2 Tim. ii. 19. [c] 1 Cor. x. 32.
[d] 1 Peter i. 14. [e] Matt. xviii. 15.

he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.

§. 4. BUT if the affair was sinful and publick; and if occasion of publick scandal was given; then such were at once to be publickly dealt with and rebuked.—This *Paul* advises *Timothy* to do; [f] *them that sin, rebuke before all, that others may fear.* And by *Sin*, he doubtless means *open* and *notorious sin*, matter of *public scandal.* And from disorderly walkers, they were even to *withdraw* themselves, and hold no familiar and brotherly converse with them, that they might be ashamed. [g] *Mark them*, says the Apostle, *which cause divisions and offences* (in the original, *scandals*) *contrary to the doctrine which ye have received, and avoid them.*—[h] *Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly.*—And from teachers of evil doctrine, and those who suppose that *gain is godliness*, he directs [i] *Timothy* to withdraw himself.—He likewise writes to the Corinthians, [k] *not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such an one, no not to eat.*—But for the greatest and most scandalous crimes, reprehension, and withdrawing from the criminals, were not to suffice; for with respect to the incestuous *Corinthian*, the Apostle directs the Church, to [l] *put away from among* themselves *that wicked person.*—And he tells *Timothy*, that [m] *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* having put away faith and a *good conscience*; and [n] *Hymeneus* in particular, being a profane babler, and with *Philetus* saying *that the resurrection was past already; he had deli-*

[f] 1 Tim. v. 20. [g] Rom. xiv. 17. [h] 2 Theff. iii. 6.
[i] 1 Tim. vi. 5. [k] 1 Cor. v. 11.
[l] 1 Cor. v. 13. [m] 1 Tim. xix. 20. [n] 2 Tim. ii. 16, 17, 18.

vered them unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme; or, in other terms, had probably inflicted on them some signal punishment, in order to humble them and bring them to repentance, for their evil doings.

§. 5. It furthermore appears, from the general tenour of the New Testament, that the Apostles were for cutting off, or excommunicating none, but for things and opinions which dishonoured God, or injured man; for moral evil, or what led to it. For although we do not learn, that the (Jewish) Christian teachers in the Christian church, who were for introducing [o] *circumcision* and *the whole law* of *Moses* among *even the Gentile-Christians*, were in general men of vicious or scandalous lives; yet because they were warm and strenuous in their preaching and endeavours, for putting *a yoke on the necks of the disciples, which* even *Peter* owns [p] *neither their fathers nor they were able to bear*, insisting on it, that unless they complied with those things, and blended the cumbersome ceremonies of the law with the simplicity of the gospel, *they could not be saved;* and especially as they had principally a view to their own advantage in it, and [q] *did not serve our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly;* [r] *teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake;* these, the Apostle would have [s] *cut off* from communion.

§. 6. But, for differences in opinion and practice, about lesser and more indifferent matters, we find no evidence, that any were expelled the church, or molested in it.—And differences in judgment and practice amongst some of the Apostles themselves arose early. *Peter* as well as *Paul* conversed freely with the Gentile-Christians at *Antioch*, and did not eat with them: but when *certain* came from *James* at

[o] Acts xv. 5. [p] xv. 10. [q] Rom. xvi. 18.
[r] Tit. i. 11. [s] Gal. v. 12.

Jerusalem, *Peter*, and even *Barnabas* and others, separated themselves, fearing reprehension from the Jewish Christians; [t] *Paul* withstood *Peter* to the face for it.—And when *Paul* went up by revelation to *Jerusalem*, after he had been preaching and gathering many churches in the Heathen nations, he [u] *privately communicated* to those *only* who *were of reputation*, and could bear it, that gospel which he had preached among the Gentiles consisting in an exemption from the Jewish law and ritual, the instances of avoiding meats offered to idols, things strangled, and blood, excepted. These Elders *of reputation* tell the Apostle, [w] *Thou seest how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law*—and they *must needs come together*; *for they will hear that thou art come—and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews, which are among the Gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs;* (which appears too in the case of *Titus*, whom he would not allow to be circumcised; and from his doctrine, *Gal.* v. 2. and more largely still in his *Epistle* to the *Hebrews;*) *do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them, purify thyself*—according as our law directs, to convince them that such report is false; and *that thou thyself walkest orderly, and keepest the law.*—By this it appears, that the Apostles and Elders at *Jerusalem* had not then brought the believers to forsake (or even to cool in their zeal to) the law and usages, or even the offerings of the Jewish ritual; seeing they persuaded the Apostle to comply with the law of vows: And yet it is well known that *Paul* was for setting all christians at liberty from that dispensation, the ce-

[t] Gal. ii. 12, &c. [u] ii. 2.
[w] Acts xxi. 20, &c.

remonies and offerings of which could not make the retainers to it perfect.

§. 7. TOUCHING a difference that happened at *Rome* particularly, and probably *too* at many other places, between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, with regard to a distinction of meats and days; *Paul*, in an epistle to that church, enters professedly into the subject; and after advising the leading members of it, [x] to receive them *who were weak in the faith, but not to doubtful disputations*, or disputations about doubtful or indifferent matters; does not decide in favour of the observance or non-observance of such things; declares neither party right or wrong; nor censures either about it.—But observing that some judged and set at nought their brethren on that account, he reprehends them for it; and asks them, (or rather *him*) [y] *who art thou* (by whose authority dost thou act, and set thyself thus high) *that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.*—[z] *For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.*—And considering things, little as these are, to be nearly indifferent in their nature; as having nothing in them, that would dishonour the Christian profession; the Apostle *would not admit them to be esteemed objects of church-discipline*, or *subjects of censure*:—And knowing that a compliance in such cases, from a fear of censure, without conviction of duty, was *really* hypocrisy; like a wise and good servant, zealous of his *Lord*'s honour, and his brethren's edification in grace and goodness, he kindly recommends and leaves them to a mutual toleration, in acting as they were *fully persuaded in their own minds*; and seems to have penned that part of his epistle to the Romans, now contained in the 14th and 15th chapters, on purpose to press on them the duty, and

[x] Rom. xiv. 1. [y] xiv. 4. [z] ver. 10.

to direct them in the use, of kindness, forbearance, and charity to one another.

§. 8. JOHN indeed told his Master, [a] *we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbad him, because he followed not with us:*—John, *then*, not fully cured of pride, and a contracted mind, thought none could do well and be accepted, but those who followed with them; and therefore was for stopping him who was engaged in so good a work as *the casting out devils.*—But our Lord knew and taught his disciples better; [b] *forbid him not.*—And when *James* and *John* [c] asked leave of their Lord, to command fire to come down from Heaven, to consume a Samaritan village, which would not receive their Master; he turned and rebuked them, and told them, *Ye know not what spirit ye are of:*—Your vindictive spirit does not agree with my spirit of peace and love.

§. 9. PAUL tells his brethren at [d] *Philippi*, that many *things had happened to him, which had fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel: So that his bonds in Christ were manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by his bonds, were much more bold to speak the word without fear.—Some indeed* (adds the Apostle) *preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good-will, &c. What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.*—And though some of these, (so far from following the example of the Apostle) [e] *preached Christ of contention, supposing to add affliction to his bonds;* yet as he was heartily engaged for the service of the gospel among men, he

[a] Luke ix. 49. [b] ibid. [c] ix. 54, &c.
[d] Phil. i. 12, &c. [e] Phil. i. 16.

rejoiced in the spreading of it, even by men of *this* stamp; and would not make such a deviation from his peaceable ministry *a subject of discipline and censure*, but left a noble example to his successors of generosity and forbearance; rejoicing that his Lord's work was done, and men gathered and saved, *though not in a way that he approved.*—He was too wise, and too pious, not to believe that the gracious purpose of heaven might be promoted by means of men, whose sentiments were somewhat different from his own, even by those whom he could not think *free* from the infirmity of a *contentious spirit.* [f] *If a man,* says Paul, *purge himself from these,* (i. e. workers of iniquity) *he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared for every good work.*—In Paul's judgment, men cleansed and sanctified are meet for the master's use, and prepared for every good work. —In the judgment of some of his *pretended* successors, such men are *not* meet for the master's use and service, unless they entirely fall in with those systems of opinion, which these men declare to be the doctrines and dictates of the divine spirit; though they are incapable of proving them such, by those writings, which they all publickly declare to be the judge and test of truth and orthodoxy, *namely,* the holy scriptures.

§. 10. NEVERTHELESS, setting aside some heats and contentions fomented by certain warm and leading men, Church-Discipline was, in the main, duly guarded, and directed to its proper object, for the first two or three hundred years after Christ; though some great authors will scarce allow thus much.—If *Victor* bishop of *Rome,* and his colleagues, did contend with, and at last excommunicate the Eastern Churches, for observing *Easter* at a different time from those of the West; not only

[f] 2 Tim. ii. 21.

the opposite side, but many of his own party, condemned him as rash, heady, and turbulent: And when *Stephen* bishop of *Rome* anathematized *Cyprian* bishop of *Carthage*, for thinking differently from him on (so *weighty a point* as) the validity of heretical baptism, others condemned *Stephen* as a breaker and disturber of the church's peace, by endeavouring to impose on others the belief of such a disputable point; [g] "which, says *Firmilian*, (according to *Lord King*,) was never wont to be done; but every church followed their own different ways, and never therefore broke the unity and peace of the Catholick church; which now, says he, *Stephen* dares to do, and breaks that peace, which the ancient bishops always preserved in mutual love and honour. And, therefore, we find in the acts of that great council of *Carthage*, convened to determine this matter, that when *Cyprian* summed up the debates thereof, he dissuades his fellow-bishops from the imposing humour and temper of *Stephen*.—It now remains, saith he, that every one of us declare our judgments of this matter; judging no man, or removing any one from our communion, if he think otherwise than we do; for let none of us make himself a bishop of bishops, or, by a tyrannical terror, compel his colleagues to the necessity of obeying.

"So that the attempting to force a belief in these lesser matters was cruelty and tyranny in the imposers thereof; who, for such unreasonable practices, were looked upon as enemies to, and violators of, the church's concord; being the true schismaticks; inasmuch as *they* were the cause of schism and division.—But, *positively*, (continues *Lord King*[h]) the unity of the church uni-

[g] Lord King's Enquiry, chap. 9, §. 2. [h] Sect. 3.

"versal consisted in an harmonious assent to the "*essential* articles of religion, or in an unanimous "agreement in the fundamentals of faith and doc-"trine."—They did not generally make their agreement in lesser things a subject of contention and censure.—And those industrious enquirers into the faith, doctrine, and discipline of the Primitive Church, *Cave* in his *Primitive Christianity*, and *Bingham* in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, bear testimony nearly to the same purpose; and prove, that the great object of the good men of those days was, as far as they could, to preserve the church clean from the imputation of countenancing scandals and enormities; labouring, by every means, to bring scandalous members to repentance and a confession of their crimes, or to expel them the church: And *Bingham* particularly observes, that "as to "the objects of ecclesiastical discipline, they were "*such delinquents* as fell into great and scandalous "crimes after baptism, whether men or women, "priests or people, rich or poor, princes or subjects."

§. 11. But though Christians did not go great lengths in persecution, for the first two or three centuries after Christ, whilst they themselves were pressed and destroyed by it; yet as soon as *Constantine*, the first Christian Emperor, became a Christian, and gave the Christians full liberty, and furnished the bishops with riches and power; they began to quarrel with and persecute one another, on account of a diversity of * modes of faith held and maintained by many; insomuch, that it must have appeared to an indifferent observer, that heats and

* And in order to fix an uniformity in faith, they formed creeds, and those who had most power imposed the belief of their creeds on others, and persecuted those who could not receive them; and thus the remedy became worse than the disease. The best unity (that of the spirit) was broken by an attempt to fix an uniformity of faith.

persecutions were the genuine fruits of the Christian spirit and temper; and that persecution from others had only laid it under an external restraint, which was no sooner removed, than it arose and appeared in its proper colours: As in the case of the *Arian* contest and persecution, the *Donatists*, *Montanists*, and others.—And yet it is certain, that no system of religious doctrines, ever published in the world, inculcated love and forbearance, or discountenanced imposition and severity, so much as *that:* We must therefore impute this foolish, ungenerous, and unjust disposition, to the pride and corruption of human nature; as a love of persecution, on account of principles and practices purely religious, has discovered itself, with nearly equal evidence and severity, in all ages and nations.—A spirit of bigotry, a love of dominion, and an endeavour to suppress all enquiry, that tended to expose the error of any part of systems of received orthodoxy, have acted much the same part in all parties, nations, and ages, where they have not lain under any external restraint.

§. 12. For with what virulence and clamour, with what terror, fury, and blood, the most knowing and polite parts of the Pagan world, persecuted the early Christians, is clearly seen in the histories of those times under Paganism.—Even *Tacitus* and *Suetonius*, the Roman historians, have discovered their ill-will towards the Christians.—And what cruelties have been committed, and what tragedies acted in the Popish church, are recorded by too many to be soon forgotten!—*Wickliffe*, *Huss*, *Luther*, *Cranmer*, *Calvin*, and many others of the first reformers, were vilified as hereticks, innovators, sectaries, breakers of the peace and unity of the ancient Catholick infallible church, and treated with the greatest contempt and indignity; and every art and stratagem were used to ensnare and destroy them. The Pope excommunicated the most emi-

nent among them; imperial edicta were issued to silence more; and the civil powers almost every where were drawn in to execute the penalties of ecclesiastical laws, and become the agents and dupes of papal pride and vengeance.—*Wickliffe*'s doctrine was condemned by the Pope's delegates, and himself enjoined silence: And did not *Luther*, and the reformers here, meet with the same fate? Their assemblies were forbidden; their books, even their bibles, seized and burnt; heavy fines imposed on them; their persons apprehended, imprisoned and tormented: They were insulted with mere mock-trials; and if they could not become hypocrites, by recanting errors before they were convicted of any, they were turned over to the secular power, and destroyed by racks, by burnings, and by almost every method which malice could invent, or cruelty execute.—And in order to obtain and secure dominion over the faith and consciences of the people; the bishops and governors of the Popish church removed the means of information and knowledge out of their way, lest they should see through their pious frauds, and become wise and refractory: And if, notwithstanding all their caution, they found any who dared to enquire for themselves, and aimed at becoming good, and doing their duty to God in such manner as they were convinced was best; if this in any respect clashed with the creeds, rules, and orders of the church, her governors were animated with a pious zeal, to deal with, to reproach, to oppress, and persecute, such conscientious and refractory persons, in order to reclaim them; and deter others from becoming such. And the church having (as the learned [i] *Mosheim* observes) adopted early this maxim, that "errors in religion, when "maintained and adhered to, after proper admoni-

[i] Mosh. Ecclesiast. Hist. vol. 1. p. 200.

"tion, were punishable with civil penalties and cor-
"poral tortures;" they gradually professed to see further, viz. *that it was necessary to bring such to capital punishment.* For it appears, that in order to stop the progress of the gospel in the South of France, in the 12th century, when the Pope's agents could not by their preachings or threatenings effect their purpose; the Pope caused his zealous tools of the religious orders, and among the first of these the celebrated [k] *St. Bernard* and those of his order, monks of *Fontfroide*, to instigate the king and many sovereign princes then in *France*, to raise vast numbers of armed men, under the banner of the Cross, (thus forming a *croisade)* and to march them (under the security of an absolution for all past sins, and indulgences for future,) against the *Albigenses* or *Waldenses, in order to extirpate them:*—The trumpet of destruction was blown aloud by monks, friars, and others, in their sermons, to inspire these religious soldiers with fury in this *spiritual warfare*; to slay manfully, and not to let their hands spare, nor their eyes pity, till they had destroyed the Lord's enemies, the objects of their holy rage; or had driven them into mountains and deserts, or dens and caves of the earth, to perish by famine, cold, or nakedness there: And after taking many of their towns by storm, and putting the inhabitants to the sword, to the amount of many [l] thousands; that holy office *the inquisition* was then first established; and *St. Dominick* made first inquisitor, in order to finish the work begun, and carried on by the Croisès. This office destroyed its thousands, or rather its tens of thousands; and nearly

[k] Du Pin's Ecclesiast. Hist. Cent. 13. chap. 3.

[l] *Bishop Newton*, in his *Dissertation on the Prophecies*, vol. iii. page 178, says from Mede, it is computed that a million perished; but we know of no other credible historian, that makes the number near so great.

exterminated those early reformers, the *Albigenses* or *Waldenses*, inhabiting the county of *Thoulouse*, and other Southern Provinces of *France*.—And when those zealous and obedient children of the church, [m] *Ferdinand* and *Isabella* of *Spain*, were led by the instigation of church-governors to force the Moors in that kingdom to conform to the Holy Catholick Church, or perish, or fly; the inquisition *too* was introduced there, and *proved so effectual in its consequences*, as to convert 20,000, and destroy 2,000 of them in one year: And though all this was destructive of every law of equity and mercy, and greatly to the prejudice of that kingdom, as these people were industrious, and many of them opulent and good subjects, though mostly Mahometans; yet the priests, the advisers and partly the executioners of this dreadful scheme, thereby obtained great riches, the spoils of the estates of the Moors; and thus gratified at once two governing passions of ecclesiasticks, interest and ambition. And so effectual an engine has the inquisition been found, in destroying both heresy and hereticks, and thereby preserving the peace and unity of the church, and security of the papacy, that *Charles* the Vth, that sanguinary ally of the church, recommended it to his son *Philip* the IId of *Spain*, in his last will, "to highly honour and constantly support "the office of the holy inquisition, as constituted "by God against heretical pravity; because, by "this simple remedy, the most grievous offences "against God may be remedied."—And Pope *Paul* the IVth could not be quite easy in his mind, near his end, because conscious to himself, that he had neglected to establish the inquisition, where he had power to have done it!—And so determined were they to accomplish the destruction of heresy, that

[m] Marian. Hist. Spain.

what crusades and inquisitions could not effect, (and these were not practicable in all places,) they attempted by massacres: Witness the massacre in France, anno 1572, at which time it is said near 70,000 persons were cut off in cold blood in Paris, and many other parts of the kingdom, in a few days: —The infamous powder-plot in 1605, intended for making short work with the English nobility and gentry, assembled in parliament:—The massacre in Ireland in 1641, when many thousands perished by violence, cold, and famine:—The revocation of the edict of Nantz in France in 1685, and the consequent persecution, whereby many thousands perished by the most cruel and inhuman treatment at their homes, and many who fled, by nakedness, cold, and famine:—*Finally*, the outrages and barbarities committed by the Papists, a second time, on the Protestants in Ireland, in 1690.—These, with many other instances of a like nature, (but which for brevity's sake are omitted) may be considered, in part at least, as a history of Church-Discipline, in its last and most dreadful stage, executed often by the state, but *always* at the instigation or command of the church.

§. 13. For when civil governors have once suffered their consciences to be misled and perverted by ecclesiasticks, they become the willing and zealous instruments of the pride and cruelty of church-governors.—Many instances in the persecutions already mentioned, are proofs of it; particularly, that eminent one of the revocation of the edict of Nantz, when so great a man as Lewis the XIVth of France, resigning his understanding to his spiritual guides, and submitting with docility to his holy mother, the Church, suffered his conscience to be so far perverted and misled, as to revoke the said edict; by which the Protestants of his kingdom had enjoyed a legal toleration near 90 years, though not without

great interruptions from religious bigotry, craft, and rage: And after many ineffectual and improbable attempts to convert them to the *Catholick Faith*, he let loose his dragoons upon them, and by every conceivable method of plunder, abuse, and cruelty, determined to drive them into conformity, or into mountains and deserts; or into foreign countries, if they could escape the vigilance of those who were posted at the most likely places to prevent it. Thus was he guilty of a persecution, unusual in the manner of it, but to many more grievous and abhorrent than death itself; and after this, he afflicted and persecuted a part of his own church, the pious, though in some instances, the mistaken Jansenists. —He is said, indeed, to have discovered signs of remorse for those severities before he died, which shews that the power of bigotry could not make him proof against the relentings of his humanity, nor fully silence the reproaches of his conscience: And this, no doubt, induced him to tell his confessor, and the Archbishop of Paris, who pressed those measures upon him, that he had acted under their direction and influence in that business; and if wrong, they must answer for it.—Ignorant and deluded man! to think, that as God had given him understanding to distinguish *right* from *wrong*, *just* from *unjust*, *mercy* and *good faith* from *cruelty* and *perfidy*; that he must not answer for crimes of his own commission; or that he had a warrant to be uncharitable and cruel for the name and church of God, when God has forbidden all uncharitableness and cruelty:—To suppose that the punishment due for a crime can be transferred, from him who commits or authorises it, to him who advises and presses it; and that both are not equally guilty before God!

§. 14. FERDINAND and ISABELLA, before mentioned, are instances likewise of ecclesiastical vassalage: They were zealous, and therefore proper

instruments of mischief. Pervert and mislead the consciences of such sovereigns, and tell them what they are to do, on pain of damnation, and their zeal and their rage will effect the business.

§. 15. THESE are instances of consciences abused and misled, of being honest, and having a zeal for God; but so far from being according to knowledge and love, that they were according to ignorance and destruction.—It would have tended to the credit and promotion of the Reformation, if its professors had discovered so much wisdom and temper, as to have avoided the spirit and the work of persecution. But good and highly commendable as many of the early reformers were, we must consider them as only emerging out of a church, so much accustomed to persecution, that a right to persecute all who were *schismatical* and *heretical*, seemed to be a first principle: Though one might well think, that seeing the injustice, and feeling the cruelty of the Romanists in their persecutions, they might have learned *Christ* better, as well in practice as in doctrine. —And yet *Cranmer* advised the burning of *Joan* of *Kent*, and *Calvin* that of *Servetus*.—Our early English reformers likewise, who had survived the *Marian* persecution, when cloathed with honour and power under Queen *Elizabeth*, *James* I. and their successors under the two *Charles's*, persecuted the pious *Brownists*, *Puritans*, and other *Dissenters*, who could not comply with their liturgy, articles, and canons; and so allowed the validity of the Popish argument for persecuting heretics.—Nor were the *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and *Helvetic Churches*, as ecclesiastical bodies, clear of decisions and resolutions, that evidently tended to promote discord, tyranny, and persecution.—Witness *the form of concord* in *Saxony*; *the decisions* of the synod of *Dort* in *Holland*; *the form of agreement* in

Switzerland; and *the catechism of the assembly* at *Westminster*.

§. 16. And even *we*, the people called Quakers, (I mean the most zealous and governing part of the society) far from discovering that charity of sentiment; that kindness and forbearance, so becoming men, and so essential to Christians, and which our general character for mildness would afford reason for us to discover; are not pursuing only things that make for peace, and whereby one may edify another; but, without attending to consequences, are giving into narrow and intolerant principles and practices. Since that generation, who felt the weight of persecution themselves, have been all removed, we have been long forming and proposing to our several meetings,* questions, strictures, and rules, unknown to our society for about the first seventy years; not on fundamental points only, but on such as are, and ever will be, disputable. It is no wonder then, if we gradually lessen our Christian Liberty, cease to act with the harmony and love of Christians, and run into contention about things, in which, on the footing of Apostolic Doctrine, every one ought to be left at full liberty. No wonder, that we degenerate in point of charity and love, whilst we propose such questions yearly through the society, and make the subjects of them the tests of peace and unity; and

* Anno 1721, The question was first formed to be answered annually by the several counties, respecting paying or receiving tithes.—See also subsequent additions.

In 1737, A recommendation was agreed on, to appoint persons to go about and *interrogate* individuals, who did not bring in accounts of *sufferings* for tithes, &c.

In 1749, A recommendation was adopted, purporting to be founded on *scripture*, to *adhere strictly*, to the obstruction of first and even of *second* cousins, from marriage. To these may be now added, sundry new-modelings of the marriage-process,—the *power* of *men*'s and *women*'s meetings, &c. &c.

also countenance and spread such maxims as are contained in a piece called *Brief Remarks*, &c. by *J. Griffith*; (printed and published with the approbation of our Society-censors, and by order of a standing committee of our yearly meeting;) a book that contains maxims of ecclesiastical slavery! Maxims, better adapted to the Popish than any Protestant Church, but especially ours: Maxims, that must ever furnish occasion for dissention and discord, and prevent the growth of love and union in any society!—These are some of them: [n] "Every "member is strictly bound to maintain the esta-"blished rules of that body he is joined with: That "it behoves this body, immediately upon the trans-"gression of its rules and orders, to exert itself in "dealing with transgressors, in order to restore "them; or on failure of success, to disown or re-"fuse to have unity with such."—Now, if Protestancy *is*, (and *William Penn* says it,) *a restoring to every man his right of enquiry and choice*: If it is a belief of the truth of doctrines and practices on examination and conviction, and not on human authority: And if Popery be a belief of the truth of doctrines and practices without examination and conviction, but merely on a blind and absolute obedience to church-authority and infallibility; which on both sides is nearly the state of the case: Then, J. GRIFFITH's obligation to maintain the rules of the body a man is joined to, and the obligation on this body to exert itself immediately on the transgression of its rules and orders, to restore, or cut off, such offending members, are in reality better adapted to support Popery than Protestancy, and are directly Popish Principles; though, it is probable, he did not know it.—It shews too, with how much similarity the love of church-power and government

[n] Page 77.

on the one hand, and methods used to produce submission on the other, operate on the minds of those who are infatuated with it, under different religious professions.—To prove this the more clearly, we will produce two articles of the celebrated creed of Pope *Pius* IV. selected out of the resolutions of the last general Council, *namely*, that of *Trent*, *viz.*

Art. 43. "I most firmly admit and embrace the "apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all "other observations and constitutions of the same "church;" (meaning *the Roman.)*

Art. 14. "I do admit the Holy Scriptures in the "same sense that Holy Mother Church doth, whose "business it is to judge of the true sense and inter-"pretation of them; and I will interpret them ac-"cording to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

Now here to run a parallel, let it be noted, that *J. Griffith* declares, that *the members are bound to maintain the established rules of the body:*

The Popish body declares, that *they embrace all the traditions and observations of their church.*—And the heads of both will enforce obedience.

JOHN GRIFFITH says, *it behoves the body immediately on the breach of its rules and orders, to exert itself in dealing, reclaiming, or expelling.*

THE Popish Body allows their church *to interpret Scripture, and form rules and orders as they will;* and it is but too well known, how much they think themselves obliged *to deal* with those who break them.

BOTH receive their several rules and orders without examining the truth and propriety of them.

Both go upon a presumption, that unlimited obedience is due to Church-Authority; and *both* are as opposite to the doctrine of our Lord and his Apostles, as truth is to falsehood, and mercy to severity!

BOTH go upon a supposition, that the church has not only a right to advise and exhort, in case of a

difference in sentiment or practice, (which is justly allowable, as *that* may be done consistently with love) but a right also, and that it is *her duty to exert herself authoritatively* to *deal* with, to *censure*, and in case of non-conformity, *to put out of the church.*

§. 17. So far *both* go equal lengths: The Papist indeed often goes further; his zeal is of a more exterminating kind; for besides *putting them out of the church*, he likewise *puts them out of the world.* —*Both* are guilty of persecution, which is a *punishment* or *inconvenience*, either *negative* or *positive*, of any kind, inflicted on persons, for the sake of something religious.—But though they both run the same lengths, so far as the civil establishment will respectively permit either; yet it is observable, that our society affixes its highest penalty to many breaches of its rules and orders only: The same on little external things, that cannot be proved to be evil, as they do on the greatest enormities; which reflects no great honour on the piety or justice of the founders of this kind of discipline. For it must be esteemed enormous and unaccountable, that any men of equity and understanding, and especially Protestants, should fix as severe a penalty on the *payment of tithes*, and the *marriage of cousins-german*, (or first-cousins) the marriages of any by a priest, (as well with as without parents' consent,) and even the parents of such, if they consent to it, (things which, though inconsistent with our general profession, are yet no sins,) as upon *adultery* and *drunkenness.*—The laws of this, and of all civilized nations, very justly make a great difference between the punishment or penalty due to great and small crimes or injuries: And every sensible man must conceive a very mean opinion of that law-giver, who should not do so, but who should (with many of the American Indians) punish capitally for every offence, or not at all.

§. 18. And on a supposition that the doctrines and maxims which we have undertaken to refute, are *really* true and just; then *Martin Luther, Ulric Zuingle, John Calvin,* and their many worthy co-adjutors in the work of reformation from the corruptions of Popery, and in which many fell victims to the rage and cruelty of their adversaries, were wrong and blameable; seeing they transgressed *the rules and orders of that body to which they belonged,* and from which they had never been separated by excommunication on the part of the Pope and his adherents; and the same is true of all who have testified against the superstitious rules and orders of their societies since: - Such fatal errors are men led into, who are giving such an unlimited power to church-governors.—But perhaps we may be told, that they intend such power only for *the true church.*—And is it then so easy a task, to prove which church is clearly and uniformly such, exclusive of all others? for on this footing, *every church would claim that power, as it really does the character of the true church.*

§. 19. If it be said, that *every society of every kind has an undoubted right to exclude every member that breaks the rules and orders formed by it;* —it is granted, with regard to any *civil society,* provided *all its rules and orders are made known to every member, at his admittance into it.*—But with regard to a *Christian Society,* professedly formed upon the laws and rules of Christianity, the case is otherwise: For here every member has a right *to examine and judge* whether the society, of which he is a member, is in fact governed by the laws and rules laid down in the sacred records.—The commendation of the *Bereans,* for [o] *searching the scriptures,* that they might act from judgment and not from authority, proves this:—And this was the

[o] Acts xvii. 11.

very principle and plan of the first reformers. They searched the sacred records, and finding in what gross errors they were involved, departed from them.—A *Christian Society*, therefore, must be governed by *Christian Principles*; and no laws or rules made now are of any force, if not agreeable to those made and recorded by the Holy Ghost; and of these every one must be a judge for himself.—This is the Protestant plan; and every thing contrary to this is, *whatever the maker thinks fit, besides real Christianity.*

§. 20. To a person well-acquainted with the love, the forbearance, and tenderness towards the brethren, so often and so closely enjoined by our Lord and his Apostles; it should seem matter of astonishment to see men sober and pious, and in general exemplary, act a part so inconsistent with the essential nature and laws of their profession, as to raise and pursue discord and contention, in reprehending such as cannot comply with some lesser acts or omissions in the church, and *finally* after repeated admonitions, if they refuse compliance, in casting them out of close communion, or totally out of the church.—But it is evident to those who are acquainted *also* with the stratagems of Satan, that men of great zeal, contracted minds, and lovers of power, have usually acted in this manner.—The history of the church, is, indeed, an history of the frailty and corruption of the human heart; and this is nearly alike evident in all churches.—Satan suits his baits to his objects: To religious and virtuous men, temptations to vice, in the usual sense of the word, would rarely operate; but many of these are not secure against the assaults of spiritual pride. For as they are apt to presume, that they are the favourites of Heaven, enjoy the peculiar communications of God's spirit, and are fitted with sound judgment to rule in his church; Satan holds out to them the bait of *discernment of spirits*,

and the *power* and *duty of censure*: This bait is readily swallowed, and such persons becoming infatuated with it, think themselves *anointed as judges in Israel*, to seek out, to censure, and set at nought, all who come not up to their standard of orthodoxy.—They imagine themselves engaged in the *Lord's* cause, and cannot bear to have that point so much as called in question, when it is clear to every judicious person, that can but compare actions with the proper rule and source of actions, that they are really contending with, and beating their fellow-servants, not only without their Lord's authority, but against his will; not doing their Lord's work, but their own; not only doing no good, but doing evil; not promoting union and strength, but discord and weakness.—They would persuade their brethren to think that the church is offended, and therefore they must engage in her quarrel.—But is it not a pity, that any of the Lord's servants should think his church offended by any little thing, that does not really dishonour him, or their holy profession of him, and therefore does not offend him? That they should think, that though Paul disclaimed dominion over his brethren's faith, (and would not so much as decide upon some lesser and more doubtful matters, but instead of decision and judgment, substituted the use of charity and forbearance,) they are favoured beyond him, with a right to claim, and a power to use it? That they have a right and a call to be severe, where their Lord is mild and forgiving? That they are not so wise, so kind, and humble, as to be content to apply Paul's healing doctrine about days, drinks, and meats, to every subject of dispute, which is alike little and disinteresting; and in which good men cannot agree; and of course is not necessary to salvation?—That they should be so far unacquainted with their own spirits and passions, as to think both employed in *their Lord's cause* and ser-

vice, *when they are most certainly employed in the work and service of the enemy of all good, the father of discord and grand accuser of the brethren.*

§. 21. But zeal, the principal qualification of these men, is a dangerous thing, if not well governed.—*William Penn* [p] said, "Zeal dropt in Charity "is good; without it, good for nothing; for it de-"stroys all it comes near."

"It is," says *Archbishop Tillotson*, "an edge-"tool, which children in understanding should not "meddle with; and yet it most frequently posses-"seth the weakest minds; and commonly by how "much less knowing people are, by so much the "more zealous they are. Zeal is only fit for wise "men: It is one of the most ungovernable passions "of human nature, and therefore requires great "judgment and knowledge to manage it, and keep "it within due bounds.—It is most frequently em-"ployed about what it should not be. It is either "mistaken in the object, or in the measure and de-"gree of it.—And even when it is a virtue, it is a "nice and dangerous one; for the wisest men are "apt to mix their passions and interests with their "zeal for God and Religion: So that it is not "enough, that men are acted by a zeal for God, and "so sincerely follow the dictates of their consciences: "But they *must be careful to inform their consci-"ences, and not suffer themselves to be violently "transported and hurried by their own passions "and prejudices, and by a blind zeal without "knowledge.*"—We should question that zeal, "which is contrary to *Christian Goodness and "Meekness, Peace and Charity.*—If the thing "about which our zeal is conversant be of a doubt-"ful nature, this is not properly an object of zeal: "Men should never be earnest about any thing,

[p] Reflections and Maxims.

"but upon clear and certain grounds, that what we "contend so earnestly for, is undoubtedly good; and "that what we are so violently against, is undoubt-"edly evil: If it be not, we are zealous for we know "not what; and that, I am sure, is not a zeal ac-"cording to knowledge."

THE Archbishop, it seems, had found some whose *zeal was warmed by their passions and prejudices;* and *perhaps* such persons may be found now, as well as others who are *very earnest about things, which are not built upon very clear and certain grounds.* But to return,

§. 22. UNION and mutual love tend so much to mutual assistance and growth in grace, that we should do nothing that tends to destroy, or even to weaken love.—This is a truth too clear and amiable not to have its pretended advocates among those, who are but little influenced by its nature in their religious conduct. Men are to be found, who would call themselves injured by a supposition that their intemperate zeal for church government was not *founded in true love.* But in the view of impartial and wise men, such pretenders must ever appear as they really are, *deluded of the enemy of all good,* or *the wilful confounders of good and evil.* And such a character may undoubtedly be fixed on those who take upon them to judge and censure their brethren, for a conscientious dissent in non-essential matters. If they censure and cast out their brethren for such causes, not only without a warrant, but even *against the clear doctrine and intention of the Holy Ghost in such cases;* then they are the cause of, and properly answerable for all the contention and evil, negative and positive, that flow from it. And that these men really do this without warrant, and in direct opposition to the benevolent spirit of the Gospel Dispensation, is clear from the

general tenor of the whole New Testament.—*Lord King* (as noted §. 10.) has observed on the conduct of some, who attempted to force a belief, or inflict censure in some lesser matters; that [q] "they were "esteemed not as preservers and maintainers, but "as violators and breakers of the Church's unity "and concord."—And the judicious *Bishop Taylor* says, [r] "In all the animadversions against errors in "the New Testament, no pious person was con-"demned: Something was amiss *in genere mo-"rum;* (in his actions.) *Heresy* is not an error of "the understanding, but of the will: And, indeed, "if we remember that *St. Paul* reckons *heresy* "among the works of the flesh, and ranks it with "all manner of impieties, we shall easily perceive, "that if a man mingles not vice with his opinions, "his error is his misery, not his crime. *Opinions "and persons must be judged like other things.* "It must be a *crime*, and it must be *open*, of which "any *cognizance can be taken: Nor error then, "nor its consequence, is to be charged as criminal "upon a pious person;* since no simple error is sin, "nor does condemn us before the throne of God." —Again,

[s] "BODIES of confession, and articles, do much "hurt, by becoming instruments of dividing com-"munions.—Men would do well to consider, whe-"ther or no such proceedings do not derive the guilt "of schism upon those who least think it; and "whether of the two is the schismatic, he who "makes *unnecessary impositions*, or he who dis-"obeys them, because he cannot, without doing "violence to his conscience, believe them."

NOW if these things are so, the case is clear, that those who judge and censure their brethren for a different sentiment or practice in matters non-es-

[q] Chap. ix. §. 2. [r] Libert. of Proph. [s] Ibid. §. 22.

sential, or even disputable, are *really* guilty of introducing contention, and destroying love and unity in the church, and are of themselves the real schismatics. Nor can those advocates for judgment and censure avoid this conclusion, till they have previously established the truth of another doctrine, viz. That *it is the duty of every member of a church, to believe as the church believes;*—which has not yet been done: And the absurdity of supposing this, and acting according to such supposition, I hope has been already sufficiently proved. I shall just add, that if that were true, haughty and sour men of every denomination, who are so happy as to swim in the current of the true faith, would never want a plausible pretext for their orthodox and pious quarrels, with those who are so honest as to dissent from what they cannot comply with, agreeably to the clear dictates of their consciences.

§. 23. Our Lord and his Apostles had the conversion and sanctification of men above all things in view, and therefore were not rigid, punctilious, and censorious about small things, but chose to bend to their weaknesses and prejudices; and Paul [t] *even* became *all things to all men, that he might by all means save some.* And knowing how much a rigid zeal, for or against little external usages and things, tended to occupy, engage, and heat the mind, and prevent a growth in the substance and life of religion, pressed forbearance and kindness; and even made it the distinguishing mark of Christianity. He was not disposed to be overbearing, rigid, and censorious about non-essentials;—but to bear with things which made no substantial part of Christian holiness; nor did he assume, but disclaimed [u] dominion over the faith of his brethren; and even enjoined them to embrace nothing upon trust and his autho-

[t] 1 Cor. ix. 22. [u] 2 Cor. i. 24.

rity only; but to judge for themselves and [w] *prove all things*, before they embraced them as truths and matter of duty.

§. 26. And it would be very becoming of church-governors now, who cannot produce *quite so good credentials of their divine mission as the Apostles did;* if they would imitate their humility and moderation, with regard to their claims of power. For let them but consider the passions of the human mind, and they will find, that their censures of their brethren for small differences, on no authority but their own, must needs beget unkind resentment and coldness in point of affection, and dissolve that unity of spirit, which is the only bond of peace, and the source of mutual good offices in religious society. Those who see not these consequences, are much wanting in wisdom, and those who seeing do not avoid the occasion of them, must be equally wanting in goodness.

§. 27. Nor can the apology which some make, that such men are very honest and mean well, be admitted; since *well-meaning with ill-doing in this kind, is a mischievous compound.*—It is no less than a breach of Christ's new commandment; and with this aggravating circumstance, that it is done under a pretension to his authority, which supposes that he moves men now by his spirit, to violate his own express doctrines left upon record for our instruction.—Many of the most outrageous persecutors in different ages were esteemed very pious and good men, and had the honour of their respective churches in view; and were only labouring to maintain an uniformity, and prevent their faith and discipline from being *laid waste*, by such as dared to question or oppose their truth and propriety.

§. 28. I must indeed own, that I neither know, nor can conceive, why church-governors cannot

[w] 1 Theſſ. v. 21.

bear with some small dissents *now* among their several members, as well, and for the same reason, as the Apostle did; who *even* directed every one to be *fully persuaded in his own mind,* before he yielded his assent to doctrines or usages pressed by others: Indeed it appears to me, as if the former thought themselves invested with a divine right to oppose the doctrine of the apostles on this head.

But if they can shew good reason for their non-forbearance; their censuring and excluding persons of irreproachable and even of very respectable lives, for a dissent in small things, contrary (as I conceive) to Apostolic doctrine and practice; they have now *a call,* and *an opportunity,* to do both; and as many of them are persons of leisure and ability, let them stand forth and defend their claims; or not a few will be fixed in a belief, that they claim and exercise a power, which sprang up in the apostate Church of Rome, and which cannot be defended on a foot of *Scripture* and *Reason,* the *proper foundation of the Protestant Religion.*

§. 29. And it appears further very clear, that if all who dissent from Society-Orthodoxy in doubtful things, are, nevertheless, not corrupt and evil men; and have not forsaken the fear and service, nor forfeited the favour of God; they will, notwithstanding such dissent, be admitted into the kingdom of heaven; and then let us consider, how impious and astonishing it is, for us to be so presumptuous as to put such out of our church!—

An extraordinary case indeed, that we shall be so rigid and contracted in our view and judgment of things, as to consider a dissent from certain points, which we have adopted as true, but cannot prove that God has declared them so, and consequently that they furnish sufficient cause for putting men out of our communion; and that men shall lose our love, and be excluded from our fellowship, who, for

aught that we can prove, or have reason to think, will enjoy the favour and glory of God!

§. 30. But let me propose it to the good and the wise, to consider whether "the God of the spirits "of all flesh," who has in the general formed the minds of men in all nations alike, *could not*, and if he had thought it best on the whole, *would not*, have found means to have produced *an uniformity of religious sentiments and practices amongst all mankind?* And as *he has not*, may we not presume, that a diversity of religious sentiments is most pleasing to him? Or at furthest, if those sentiments are not evil, that they are matter of indifference to him? And is it not highly probable, that on the introduction of Christianity, (that more perfect dispensation,) if God had intended an absolute uniformity in belief and practice among Christians, he would have made it clear, beyond doubt, by a written public law, not less clear than the law of Moses; and not have left it matter of doubt and dispute, even what our present law and rule is, and who is to interpret or declare any law obligatory on others? That as he has not done so, no such uniformity was ever intended; and that it is an evidence of human presumption and arrogance, for any man to require, what God never appointed and intended? And how men shall dare to make, and be able to justify, a demand of submission to their own opinions and determinations, without being able to prove them incontestably of Divine appointment, or that they have a warrant from God for such a demand, is what I cannot conceive:—Let the sober judicious reader conceive it, if he can.

§. 31. It is evident beyond a doubt, that God has seen meet in his providence, to leave many things in our Christian dispensation, *somewhat at large and undetermined:* And divers learned and good men have thought that *Paul* penned part of

his epistle to the Romans, and particularly much of the 14th and 15th chapters, and sundry parts in his other epistles, to teach mutual charity and forbearance, under different conceptions and practices. But, alas for some high professors of Christianity, and professed followers of this enlightened Apostle! how shall they approach before the Divine Majesty, the Searcher of hearts, and pray for his mercy, and forgiveness of their offences, when they have presumed to judge without remission their fellow beings, who had not personally offended them; or, that they can prove, had dishonoured the cause of righteousness in the earth!—And as our Lord said of faith, we may well say of charity, though the acknowledged chief of Christian virtues, viz. *When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find* charity *on the earth?* Or rather shall he not find us quarrelling and contending with our fellow-servants, and some of us endeavouring to put them out of his house and service, only for performing their duty to their Lord a little differently from themselves, though with equal integrity; and in cases where our Lord has left no written law or rule, nor any living substitute or delegate, to declare his will; but where every one's duty is declaredly to serve his Lord according as he is fully persuaded is his duty on the whole?

§. 32. Let us then consider, how wisely and justly we act, when we frame, and require the assent of our brethren to any articles of faith, or (what operates alike) to any set of queries, *if not in the very words of Scripture*, and of divine authority? Because, *if we set up any thing as a rule of faith, or measure of duty, which is not in the very words and according to the tenour of Scripture; we set up human opinions for divine laws:* And then if we exact obedience to them as such, we contract the terms of Christian communion, and forfeit the regard of our brethren by so doing.—For as *Bishop*

Taylor observes, "few churches that have framed "bodies of confession, and articles, will endure "any person that is not of the same confession:" Which is a plain demonstration, that such confessions and articles do much hurt, as hath been observed before.

§. 33. But perhaps it may be objected, that the Apostle Paul assumed an authority, when he declared, [x] "*if any man obey not our word by this "epistle; note that man, and have no company "with him, that he may be ashamed.*"

To say nothing, at present, of the evidences of the Apostle's divine power and authority; and the want of them, in our modern claimants to the right of inflicting censure and judgment; *we answer*, he *did* assume an authority to direct his brethren at *Thessalonica*, to avoid [y] *such disorderly persons as would not work;* (as *Whitby* on the text believes, and I think justly:) *This* evidently appears to be the *word*, which he complained of their not obeying. —And again, *I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.*— The Romans, it seems, *had learned before*, that those who caused divisions and offences acted contrary to the doctrine of the gospel; and the Apostle, desirous that his brethren might not be taken in this snare of the enemy, admonishes them again in this very epistle, *not to judge and set at nought one another* about little things, which mankind seemed always prone to do; but to follow after peace and edification. And those who busy themselves in judging and censuring their brethren, for doing or omitting what the Holy Ghost never commanded or forbade, are most certainly the cause of those divisions and offences, which arise and flow from

[x] 2 Theff. iii. 14. [y] Rom. xvi. 15.

their so doing; and are the very persons who ought to be avoided.

§. 34. But, if any now claim a right to demand submission to their dictates, because they suppose the Apostle Paul claimed the like to his; I will engage to pay all proper regard to their claims, *when they shall have proved, that the Apostle did really claim dominion over the faith of his brethren; and that they really are led by that spirit, and clothed with that power, by which he wrought so many and such beneficial miracles, in confirmation of his divine mission.*

§. 35. If any of those censorious persons, whose claims I have encountered, shall, in order to prejudice my readers against me, charge me with a studied attempt to trample upon, and lay waste, the discipline of the society of the people called Quakers; I assure my readers, that this is so far from being the case, that I am a real friend to a proper and just discipline; limited within due bounds, and applied to proper objects, as observed in the former part of this work, §. 5, and 10. And to be particular, I judge, it should consist in an endeavour to keep the church clean, reputable, and united: And in this view, if any hold opinions tending to the dishonour of God, or the subversion of the fundamental articles of the Christian Faith; or fall into corrupt and evil practices, to the scandal of their religious profession; or shall raise strife, and contend with, and cast out their fellow-servants about trivial things and distinctions (which the Holy Ghost has never condemned,) to the dissolution of the unity of the spirit, and to the breach of the bond of peace; all these should undoubtedly become the objects of the church's care; and unless they repent, should feel the weight of her censure, so far as to prudence and kindness shall seem meet.—And in other or lesser

cases than these, I think church-discipline has nothing to do, nor should ever be applied. This, I think, should be its utmost boundary, and that every instance of rebuke or censure for diversity of belief and practice, in any thing else, is an infringement on conscience, a violation of Christ's prerogative, and a breach of Christian liberty; which should not be tolerated, but firmly opposed in every Christian society, as destructive of peace, union, and edification,—the great advantages of religious communion; and by this I think the observation in the mouths of many in the society should be measured; to wit, *that as a society we suffer for want of keeping to a more strict discipline.* For then, we should alter the terms, and say, instead of a *more strict*,—a *more just discipline.* Discipline of a bigotted kind, directed chiefly to promote an external uniformity, or gratify unworthy passion, we have seen, and the society has felt, more than enough of already. A prudent and a kind discipline, therefore, tending to keep the society clean, reputable, and united, is the thing wanting.

§. 36. The civil government of any state has no right to fine, imprison, or fix any penalty on any of its members, who do not break the peace, or endanger the safety of it, by publishing principles, or doing overt acts, which dishonour its heads, or injure its members. In like manner, the governors of any Christian church have no right to injure or molest any, who do not hold corrupt principles, or go into evil practices, which tend to dishonour Christianity; or, in other terms, to destroy (without warrant) the union, the peace, and evident advantage of society. —If any of my readers think, that my sentiments of church-discipline are too enlarged, and too general; that it ought to include many other objects; and that its *ne plus ultra* ought not to be fixed here; I request them to say how much farther it ought to

be extended; and that they would fix another and more just boundary.

For my part, after no superficial survey of the history of the church, in the various ages of it; I am clearly of opinion, that the want of having the extent of discipline fixed and determined, and keeping within the limits of it; and the adopting a right to censure and molest those, who cannot uniformly believe as it may happen to be professed the church believes; have furnished occasion, or a pretext for an occasion, for all the contention, strife, oppression, restraint, and persecution, that have reproached and wounded the Christian church from age to age; for give but the *true church* leave to go beyond the limits above-mentioned in *one instance*, and we give it to *every church* in *every instance*: Permit any but to pass the proper boundary, and all beyond is either superstition, folly, or mischief: any thing that the frailties or passions of men shall make it; any thing but propriety, equity, and truth.

§. 37. And here to run a second parallel: If a member of our society suffer positive censure and exclusion; and be thereby *negatively* deprived of the love and care of his brethren, to and over him, for his good and edification in the best part; he is punished in a very sensible manner: And it is intended as a punishment (in fact the greatest that his assuming judges can inflict) to lay him under all the difficulty and inconvenience in their power; because his own sense and persuasion will not permit him, without suffering rebuke in his own mind, to conform to some small points, which are insisted on as necessary to communion; and yet are not proved to be of divine authority, and therefore not necessary to salvation.—And it is very clear, that this procedure most certainly flows from the same principle and motive, which the Pope proceeds upon when he lays either particular fraternities, or whole kingdoms,

under an interdict; and, by a sort of general excommunication, prohibits all religious offices and means of instruction and edification by the priests; suspending those from their offices, and even forbidding Christian burial, to terrify the offending persons into a compliance.—This was often the Pope's method of making hypocrites: For a conformity to what a person cannot approve, from the motive of avoiding penalties or inconveniences, is really *hypocrisy:* And to lay persons under a strong temptation to become hypocrites, is a most unjust and unworthy thing.

§. 38. For my part, I think it, beyond every degree of comparison, more kind and friendly, more just and christian, to indulge persons in some small differences in opinion and practice in any church, than to attempt, by penalties and sufferings, to bring them, at the risque of their sincerity, into external conformity. Besides, it is laying them under a strong temptation to violate their consciences and forfeit their peace of mind.—*Berenger* of *Tours; Archbishop Cranmer; Sir John Cheke; Fenelon Archbishop of Cambray;* and many others, have been led into a submission and conformity to what they could not approve, on the footing of fear; and some have suffered no small agonies of mind for so doing. —And those who would drive men into conformity through fear, and not conviction, declare too plainly, that they prefer an hypocritical conformity to an open and honest dissent:—Whereas God loves that men should [z] *speak the truth as it is in their hearts;* and not conform in non-essential things, without *being fully persuaded in their own minds,* of the propriety of them: Which shews that men of a censorious and persecuting temper *love not what God loves.*—He loves integrity and honesty, under an

[z] Psal. xv. 2.

extensive variety; and they a conformity to their peculiar modes and tenets, even though it be hypocritical.—Men of this narrow and intolerant turn of mind, do not consider things rightly, and as they are, and will be, but as they are not. For,

§. 39. So different have been the education and prepossession of the minds of many, and so ambiguous is the rule of *duty*, on many points in question; that men of equal abilities, improvement, and piety, ever did, and ever will, construe it differently, if not sometimes in full contradiction to one another. —*Difference* of opinion and practice, therefore, seems absolutely unavoidable; and if we would avoid discord and contention about it, (which we certainly should) a full and free liberty in this respect appears to be an universal and indispensable duty; every abridgement of it a sort of crime, and a breach of our Lord's equitable rule, of *doing to others, as we ourselves would be done unto.*

[a] *Absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty, is the thing that we stand in need of;* says the judicious Locke.

§. 40. And here I shall introduce a few considerations, concerning offences and offenders, in an ecclesiastical sense.—These words, I observe, are frequently accepted and used in a sense very different from the evident meaning of them in Scripture.—For when a person holds and openly professes opinions, different in any little point from the current orthodoxy of that church of which he is a member, the governors of it, imagining that they are its proper guardians, will declare that such opinions, and perhaps some consequent practices, are *offences*, and those who hold them *offenders*; become angry with, and punish as far as they can, all who will not conform and be silent: And this too,

[a] Preface to Locke's Letter for Toleration.

without considering that *it is a point undetermined;* whether, in such instances, it be *God or Men, Christ the Head,* or *men his pretended vicegerents, that are offended.*

But it appears to me, that this is not the sense in which these words are used in the New Testament: For there they mean, *giving occasion for scandal:* as Matt. xviii. 7. *Woe to the world because of offences,* that is to say, *scandals* (σκανδαλα). Matt. v. 30. *If thy right hand offend thee,* (that is, give occason of *scandal* to thy profession).—So again, respecting the payment of tribute; *nevertheless,* said Christ, Matt. xvii. 27. *lest we offend them,* go take a fish, and in his mouth thou shalt find a piece of money; that take, and give for thee and me. (And his meaning evidently was, *lest we give occasion of reproach to my doctrine, by omitting a matter esteemed obligatory, go and pay the tribute.)* And Matt. xviii. 6. *Whoso shall offend one of these little ones;* (that is, whoso shall give occasion of *scandal* to my doctrine, and cause of stumbling to one of these little ones.—And the word translated *to offend,* in many other places signifies, to *scandalize;* as Rom. xiv. 21. and 1 Cor. viii. 13. And,

§. 41. As church governors, meeting any opposition, are apt to get high, and *declare the church offended, though they mean themselves*; and cause the offenders to feel the effects of it, as far as they can; so they are steady and inflexible in the persecution of them. It is the cause of God and his truth, say they, which is concerned; and no prudential considerations, no regard to reputation and tenderness, can prevail with them to alter their purpose, or mitigate their rigour: which has given occasion to an observation, that *nothing is usually so mistaken, so determined and cruel, as ecclesiastical zeal.*—And yet it is unaccountable to a great degree,

that men should be unkind and magisterial for Christ's sake; when it is so evident from his doctrine and practice, that he forbad and abhorred it! —Unaccountable! that men should pervert the most kind and benevolent doctrines that ever were published to the world, into an occasion and a cover for discord and severity!—That men should be more sour and contentious about religion, than about any thing else; and publicly set at nought and degrade even their brethren, about points neither *taught nor mentioned*, by their common Lord and master!

UNHAPPY men! to be so unacquainted with their own spirits and passions, as to gratify both in the actual violation of his law of love, whose authority they vouch for it; and in exposing themselves and their religious profession, to the scorn of libertines and infidels!

BUT here it will be proper to observe, that these men, these zealous church governors, presume, and would have it believed, that they are got on an eminence and see farther than others. That [b] *they perfectly understand the proper business of their day, both in the world as strangers and pilgrims, and in the church of Christ as living members thereof.* That [c] *infallible certainty is known through all the borders of Sion.* That [d] *human abilities, natural and acquired, are insufficient to manage church affairs.* That though the [e] *sacred writings contain a store of rich treasure and sublime heavenly mysteries,* yet they are *wonderfully wrapped up, and entirely concealed, from earthly wisdom and carnal policy.*

THIS evidently is intended to insinuate, that those zealous persons alone *are favoured with infallible certainty in their opinions and decisions.* That human abilities and wisdom are of small account in

[b] Griffith's Remarks, p. 38.
[c] Idem, p. 73.
[d] Idem, p. 86.
[e] Idem, p. 13.

church affairs, and towards understanding the sublime mysteries wrapped up in the holy scriptures; that this knowledge is reserved for these extraordinary persons themselves; and that they are authorised to bring forth their discoveries, and hold them out as truths and duties for others to believe and practise.

But these men should consider a few things, previous to their establishing such a claim of an exclusive qualification for revealing of mysteries, and conducting church affairs: as, 1st, It looks so like the method of the Popish priests, who teach the laity to believe (and as it encourages both idleness and vice, they like to believe) that they are not qualified to judge of religious affairs; but that this business should be left to the priests; it appears so much like an attempt to monopolise knowledge, power, and government, that every protestant should be ashamed of it. 2dly, And if we go farther back, and view the practice of our Lord and his Apostles, we shall find them appealing to the reason of men, in their unconverted state, to judge of the most important truths, as, Whether Jesus was the Christ or not? Whether the Apostles rightly applied the prophecies they cited from the Jewish prophets, to prove that Christ was the Messiah foretold; Whether the miracles Christ performed did not prove his divine mission? and other truths of great importance, as largely appears in the New Testament.

Our Lord and his Apostles, being wise and consistent, did not appeal to the understanding of men to judge of the validity and propriety of their citations from the law and the prophets, in support of the divinity of our Lord's mission and miracles; and then tell them that they contained mysteries wonderfully wrapped up and entirely concealed from earthly wisdom, &c.

They did not appeal to scripture testimony, and at the same time tell men they did not understand

it; this would have proved themselves vainly employed, and their appeal useless.—No, such absurdities have been displayed in later times, and by men, who, it is evident, needed none but themselves to proclaim their own folly.

Our Lord did not tell the Jews that they *could not* discover that Jesus was the Christ, from the testimony of the prophets, and of his own mighty works, but that they were wilfully obstinate and blind, *and would not*; they had wilfully shut their eyes and ears, and would not see, hear, and understand; and therefore their unbelief was their crime: They had the proper faculties and means of conversion afforded them, but would not make a proper use of them.

These appeals are made to them, not as already converted, but in their natural and unregenerate estate, in order to their conversion; and evidently suppose that their understandings in that state were capable of making a proper judgment of Scripture evidence and authority; and in the instance of the Bereans, contributed greatly to their convincement and conversion.

But though I am clear, for the reasons here assigned, that the natural man, as a man, is able to judge of the certainty of facts, and of the truth of doctrines, yet as his mind is cleansed, and tendered by conversion and obedience, the spirit of truth may, and often does, open his understanding to perceive, and his mind to receive, a degree of comfort and edification in reading the holy scriptures, which he was unacquainted with at his first conversion. At first, perhaps, he does not *perceive the comforts of religion, as having never felt them*: but as he grows in grace and obedience, he finds the good experience, expressions, and advice of pious predecessors, the means of edification to him; and he expe-

riences his mind to be more fully convinced, and his heart converted.

THE understanding of the world was appealed to, although they were dead in trespasses and sins, and those who honestly attended to the evidence afforded them, and were not blinded by prejudice, saw the excellency of the gospel; believed in Christ; witnessed redemption through his blood; became quickened and renewed in their minds; and having believed, received power to become the sons of God. These reflexions are introduced to shew the absurdity of the notion, that men cannot see and judge of Scripture evidence in their natural state; and to prove that the reverse is true, on evidence that must not be contested.

IT is possible, indeed, that some of these forward men may violate the law of their master, through mere ignorance, arising from the prejudice of education, and other causes; these are comparatively innocent: Others, I am sensible, have interwoven their own passions and views with their zeal; such are criminal.—I pity both for their own sakes, and that of the good cause they would be thought to be serving; at the same time that I entertain but small hopes of reforming either; as they are too much determined, to be either turned or duly moderated. —And I expect they will be on a par with me, in point of pity; as supposing or affirming, that I have been employed in an evil work; nothing less than opposing *truth* and *friends*.—But whether I am doing this, or only exposing the mistaken methods of those, who are really opposing, whilst they would have it thought they are promoting, the honour of both, I submit to the judgment of my candid readers; who, no doubt, will give the point a fair hearing, and determine according to evidence; which is all I ask.

§. 42. And that my real intentions may not be mistaken, I declare once for all, that I am far from intending any improper breach, or to form any party in society: I would not weaken its union, or interrupt its peace; but being, on the clearest and fullest evidence, convinced, that many of my zealous brethren in different parts of the nation, in the attempts to enforce uniformity of practice, by some rules of discipline, have been actually raising and fomenting discord and contention, (to say no worse) and so injuring and dividing the society; I could not think myself clear in point of duty to them, and the society at large, without publicly declaring how and wherein they do so; and I will even venture to declare, that I act under a firm belief of a judgment to come, and am desirous, as far as I can, to act consistently with that belief, by serving God, and my generation, with fidelity.

It is evident that irreligion, and a contempt of religion, prevail in the world, to the great loss and injury of mankind; and it is certain that the misapplied zeal, and consequent irreligious contention about things which the holy scriptures are either quite silent about, or lay no stress on, have contributed much to the promotion of both.

Thus far have I offered my mite, towards the removal of so great an evil; recommending what I have said *to every man's conscience in the sight of God;* and wishing we may all adopt the wise counsel of the Apostle,—*Let us, therefore, follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.* And, *Let brotherly love continue.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author and Editor of this Volume refers to the Article which immediately succeeds the following Postscript, *for an explanation of the reason why the* Postscript *now appears to have been the work of his own hand; and not of the Author of the foregoing* Treatise.

POSTSCRIPT.

By W. M.

As the foregoing sheets were not hastily penned, nor hastily sent to the press, so neither was their publication afterwards resolved on without deliberation. I wished, in a matter which so essentially concerns a whole society, to consider and weigh every thing which might possibly be urged as an objection against the expediency of publishing this pamphlet; but when I adverted to my governing motive in writing, and re-considered the great importance of a free enquiry, and honest discharge of apparent duty, my motive for publication grew stronger and stronger. It however occurred to me, on a critical review of what had been printed, that although I could see no reason for retracting any thing, or making any apology for my plain dealing, yet that some of my readers might possibly enquire, what particular improprieties of society-conduct I wished to have considered as the chief cause of my general reasoning in favour of Christian Liberty.

This determined me to add a few pages of a more particular tendency; and though I might enlarge on sundry topics, I rather choose to confine myself in what is to follow, to the much-agitated subject, and the most fruitful of discord, Tithes. In doing this, it is not my intention to take a *decisive* part in a question, about which so many sensible, pious, and respectable members of our community are not

agreed; but briefly to state the reasons, why many conscientious and valuable persons under our name cannot profess a conscientious scruple against paying those demands.—It is well known that, as a society, we have been long professing a public testimony against the lawfulness of Tithes; and I am persuaded many among us, who dissent in that testimony, are fully apprised of the ground on which our forefathers proceeded, with a view, no doubt, to disincumber Christianity of a burden which they thought unsuitable to its spiritual dignity; are sensible of the sufferings they underwent, and of the patience they manifested in bearing their testimony to the world. And lastly, that such dissenting members sincerely wish to shew to those considerations all the regard they can, consistently with the dictates of that private judgment, which alone they are constrained to think binding on them as individuals. They are no strangers to the arguments of their predecessors, or those of more modern date, as follows, viz.

FIRSTLY, "That Tithes were a part of the ceremonial law, which was to come to an end; that the bringing in of the more spiritual dispensation of the gospel, was that end; consequently, that to comply with the ordinances peculiar to that law, as though it had not been superceded, is to deny that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, and abrogated that law, and therefore utterly an antichristian practice."

But in this abstracted view of the subject, many religious tithe-payers cannot see the justice of the consequence drawn; because, although they admit the dispensation of sacrifices and ceremonies to be ended, and a dispensation more simple and spiritual to have been brought in, by the coming and ministration of Christ, yet that they no where find, in the doctrines of our Saviour and his Apostles, that tithes are either expressly, or by clear implication, declared

to be of the nature of sacrifices and expiations, and, therefore, forbidden in the Christian church: and that their non-compliance with an article not declared by Christ himself to be a part of the Christian religion, is neither a denial of the bodily coming, nor of the divinity, of Christ; nor is it an error for which they can be lawfully censured in his name. On the contrary, they are of opinion that there is no small reason to believe, that tithes were ordinarily paid by the Jewish Christians of the first century, without *apostolical* censure, seeing that they were many of them "zealous of the law," and attended the service of the temple till it was destroyed by Titus, about the year 70. They have no doubt but apostolical times were times when the great duties of men, judgment, mercy, and peace, were principally enforced and regarded; and the smaller concerns of a compliance, or non-compliance, with the appendages of devotion, regarded but little. In this sentiment they are supported by the full belief of most wise and good men. And however opinions may vary in others, it is an animating and glorious truth, that under different names of religion, and widely different terms of Christian communion, since, multitudes have lived in the lively hope, and died in the comfortable expectation of an happy immortality!

Secondly, It has been said in substance, "That as the gospel is free and universal, so the "ministers of it, having received freely, are con-"strained to give freely; and that this injunction to "give freely, plainly implies a prohibition on the "part of the people to hire ministers."

Many religious persons, under our name, who are tithe-payers, fully allow, that the gospel of Christ is free and universal in its nature; and that those who are rightly called to be ministers of it, cannot be called with a selfish desire of a carnal recompence: being filled, as such ministers must be, with

the disinterested and spiritual nature of their mission, they cannot compel any to give them meat, drink, or apparel, as a reward, that they may sit down in a luxurious indolence, neglecting the flock of Christ, and serving their own belly!* In these sentiments they fully agree with their brethren. Many also most sincerely join them in a wish, that the spirituality of the gospel more fully prevailed throughout Christendom, to the leavening of its professors into that quiet and spiritual state, in which alone they can be suitably looking unto Jesus, as the minister of ministers, and as the only wise infallible teacher. But they consider, that till divine wisdom see meet to cause such a change to take place in the minds of temporal governors, imperfection must enter into, and make a part of, those human ordinances, to which they are enjoined to be (peaceably) *subject, for the Lord's sake:* and therefore, though they entirely disapprove the principle of an hireling ministry, many of them think it most consistent with the peaceable spirit of Christianity, to let their disapprobation appear in *withdrawing*

* I do not say that such a character is applicable to the ministers of any protestant church, without *some exceptions;* but I lament that "pride, fullness of bread, and abundance "of idleness," are found among too many.—Let it be noted, that, on the other hand, I do not consider the professed, or the real, *disinterestedness* of a man's motives to be, in itself, a proof of his being a right gospel minister. I believe some have assumed that character among the Quakers themselves, (and therein have been countenanced by their brethren of similar qualifications and turn of mind) who have rather diffused ignorance and animosity, than knowledge and love; while others have been lightly esteemed, on account of their more amiable gifts. But full consistency and perfection are not to be expected among any people; and while I applaud the generous principle of a *free Ministry*, I lament that it must ever be attended with so great an inconvenience, as the opening a door for well-meaning ignorant persons of both sexes, to obtrude their solemn weakness into the temple!

from the hireling, rather than by *contending with him*, against the law of the land; on which law it is, as they conceive, and not on the ecclesiastical ground of *divine right*,* that the national ministers now claim.

THIRDLY, It hath been contended, "That a "Quaker may refuse to pay tithes upon a principle "of common justice; for that as he neither hires "nor receives any valuable consideration from the "hireling minister, he is under no equitable obli-"gation to pay such a minister wages."

THIS principle, in itself, must be allowed by tithe-payers to be indisputably just; they also admit, that it would apply conclusively to the subject, were it possible to consider tithes simply as relative to a reciprocal interest between the claimant and the person claimed of; for that as we dissent in principle from the national community, publicly disavow the national clergy as gospel ministers, and receive no spiritual benefit, real or imaginary, from their ministry; we should certainly, so far forth, be under no moral obligation to pay them for the exercise of their function. But tithes, in the opinion of many such members, are involved in too many considerations to stand in that simple point of view. They think that, however erroneous may have been the maxims and pretensions, by which tithes came

* They know that Joseph Phipps has laboured much to prove, that a pretended *jure divino* was the plea for tithes in this country, in the dark ages of Popery; a point which they never wish to dispute with him; but they are of opinion, that the pretended *jure divino* of that time is now neither believed in, nor pleaded for, in justification of the tithe-claim. That tithes are now considered in the light of a civil tax, standing on political protestant principles of government. Accordingly, although they may be sued for in an ecclesiastical court, yet are such suits removable into the temporal courts, and even to the House of Lords, as the *dernier* resort.

to be established in the Christian church, they have long been established in this country, on the plan of a general national tax on land, and its common produce, for the support of a class of men, set a-part, in effect as the spiritual servants of the state, for a purpose of supposed general benefit to the nation at large: They consider tithes as blended with the rents and purchase-money of that land, to the general exclusion of the idea of *partial* injury; but being necessarily ascertained by the rule of proportion, tithes have long been found capable of valuation, and treated as such; have long been considered as a distinct species of property, separately transferable from one man to another. They know that tithes are thus often transferred, independently of all religious considerations, and that an estimated equivalent is often paid for them by laymen, who have not the least religious scruple about the lawfulness of their rent or purchase.—They therefore think that they should be acting an unjust part, in attempting to withhold, from the legal claimant, that which is so clearly his legal right.—They not only consider the hardship of the claimant's losing it; but, looking back to the origin of their own possessions, are fully persuaded that they themselves have no right to this portion of property. They consider that, whether they buy or rent titheable land, they have always an *allowance* made on account of the tithe-incumbrance upon it; as for example, If a tithe-payer rent an estate for 80l. a year, subject likewise to the demand of tithes; and afterwards, for any private or particular reason, the landlord agree with the claimant to discharge the tithe himself, and let his estate *tithe-free;* this tenant finds himself obliged to pay 100l. a year for it, or considerably more, according to the kind, quality, &c. of the land, or he must leave it;—because it will now readily bring that increased rent. Hence they infer, that

the tithes in the first instance were not within the tenant's contract; were not his property; that to whomsoever they might belong, they belonged not to him.—Hence also they infer, how erroneously their brethren make their annual proclamation of *sufferings* for tithes, &c. to the amount of several thousand pounds in their yearly meeting epistle!

AGAIN, they consider that if two estates in land, of exactly the same kind and value in themselves, were offered for *sale*—but the one *titheable*, and the other *tithe-free;* a person buying the former will pay a less sum for it, than he must have done for the other, by the estimated value of the tithe, in the present state of the lands. He buys this estate so much the cheaper, because another person was legally invested with a part of it; or, which in effect is the same thing, with an annual claim upon it,—which the proprietor of the land could not sell: therefore they profess unequivocally to infer, that the buyer cannot be justified on any pretence, moral or religious, in setting up a claim of right to the *whole*.

FOURTHLY, They have read what Joseph Phipps asserts, (Brief Rem. p. 20) that "it is not the "Landlord that the burden falls upon, but the oc-"cupier, who has no *adequate* allowance for it. "The difference in rent between the same land, "incumbered and unincumbered, being far less than "the amount of the tithe."

Now our tithe-payers think, that to *assert* is one thing, and to *prove* is another; and are of opinion, that the truth of the above assertion is too precarious to have been with prudence so roundly and so boldly hazarded. They think that instances of such inequality will rarely be found:—That landlords who have tithe-free estates, or who let them tithe-free, are generally well acquainted with their superior value, in that state, and fix their rents accordingly. And if it were reasonable to suppose that tenants

were ever more knowing than landlords, yet the deficiency must very soon have been supplied by the readiness of tenants to get into such estates; for, exclusive of the advantage above supposed, tenants are induced to desire such farms, that they may have the *convenience* of owning their whole crops, and thereby avoid the cause of accidental contention with the parson or improprietor:—And sometimes still more, that they may enjoy the whole advantage of *improvements*, arising from extraordinary expence, particular skill, or industry;—a tax on which, in the ordinary course of things, seeming to furnish the only substantial argument, in the whole affair of tithes, on which a plausible objection can be founded, in common justice, against paying them fully.* For admitting the possibility of an *accidental* difference between the real and the estimated value of tithes to a tenant, it may be sufficient to observe, that in human affairs *accidental variations* are ever to be expected. But how a conscientious Quaker, who wishes to avail himself of J. Phipps's argument, can pretend a *religious* scruple against the *whole* of his debt, because he thinks it larger than it *might have been*, had he *contracted differently*, is what our plain-hearted tithe-payers consider as truly wonderful!—

* They do not overlook Joseph Phipps's notion, taken from Anthony Pearson, *that it is not the land which pays the tithes, where there is land in the case, but that they are taken out of the* increase; *on which account it is in the tenant's power to make the tithe little or nothing, by changing the mode of occupying his land.*—Which reasoning J. Phipps is supposed to bring to prove, *that there is no positive claim, or incumbrance upon that land:* But should our tithe-payers admit this notable argument to be *clear* and *conclusive;* still would they be of opinion, that he might as well have said, that a man having a good dwelling-house may, by beating out the windows and turning it into a barn, evade the window-tax, and the house-tax; and then have the satisfaction of inferring the illegality and unsubstantial nature of both!—

FIFTHLY, They note that Joseph Phipps, in another place, (Animadversions on Tithing, p. 35) after an attempt to shew that a tenant is not allowed the value of his tithe in the rent of his farm, says, "But was the argument under consideration a good "one in other respects, it reaches not the case where "the Quaker occupies his own land, nor where "land is out of the question, as in cities and cor-"porate towns, and other places where no prædial "tithe ariseth, and where a *modus*, or certain value "instead of tithe, is demanded of the householders."

As to the cases of cities and corporate towns, a tithe-payer would think it sufficient to refer to common experience, that if a tenant chooses to take a house at a *neat rent*, clear of all incumbrances, he may generally do so; but, just as in the case of a landed estate, he must pay the more for it, at least by the estimated amount of those incumbrances. If he take it in the ordinary way, he pays a rent proportionably lower: Joseph Phipps might perhaps reply (as in the case of land)—the reason is obvious —"Because his landlord cannot let it higher to any "tenant." But a tithe-payer would think it a mispending of time to dwell on the futility of such kind of reasoning!—And as to the case of a Quaker occupying his own land; though he might think the notion of such occupier *being the less obligated to pay tithes* equally weak, he would perhaps, by way of introducing something else, make the obvious reply,—that, admitting the occupier to be also the proprietor of the farm, yet either he in his purchase of it, or his predecessors in Lordship from whom he received it, had doubtless (as was said before) an allowance made in the price of it, proportionate to the estimated value of tithe-incumbrance: or, in other words, it was bought for so much less money than must have been paid for it, had it been tithe-free; This admitted, the consequence is obvious.

But admitting an improbable supposition, that this land had not been sold, but had descended in a lineal succession from a period antecedent to the imposition of tithes (which may perhaps be thought to bring down the disadvantage of that imposition fully to the present owner): Yet, even this, a discerning tithe-payer is of opinion, matters not at all: It is agreed, that the imposition of tithes on the lands of the laity made a *difference* between the value of such lands, and those which were, or were intended to be, exempted from the incumbrance. Now this difference must either be by lessening the value of titheable lands, or increasing that of the exempted ones.—Perhaps ingenious arguments might be brought to render either supposition the most reasonable, in the opinion of some persons;—such is the power of sophistry, and such the difference in human apprehension! But a plain-thinking tithe-payer considers, that if the difference arose from an *immediate increase* of the value to the owners of *exempted* lands in this country, then the titheable lands remained in effect just as they were before—they would sell for the same money, or let for the same neat rent; consequently, on that ground, such land-owners, by agreeing to the tithe-incumbrance, left their successors no just cause of complaint. But admitting the contrary, viz. that the *untitheable* lands did *not advance* in value; but that the *titheable* ones became *immediately reduced* in their value, to the owners, in proportion to the tithe-imposition upon them; still this effect was produced by national authority, or common consent; and such a national change, standing on such ground, a tithe-payer will not allow to be in its effects a *partial* evil to any individual land-owner. For an individual then, in this case, to attempt an appropriation, to his own private use, of a tax; or require an exemption from a legal incumbrance, professedly imposed,

(and by his unscrupulous predecessors assented to) for the public good; and which he bears but in common with the nation at large, is, in a legal view, quite unwarranted, and the principle of it as bad as "defrauding the King of his customs, duties or ex-"cise, and dealing in goods suspected to be run."

SIXTHLY, Joseph Phipps again (see Brief Remarks, p. 20) says, "No ancestor of mine had a "right to give away from me the fruits of my la-"bour and expence, which never could be his, for "purposes I cannot in conscience and equity com-"ply with. My misled predecessor never could be "entitled to dispose of my conscience and property, "for me, before I existed, in support of the pre-"vailing errors of his age."

THESE are bold assertions; but tithe-payers, who frequently love to examine into the agreement between words and things, are ready to doubt their *fitness:* For they are persuaded that such ancestor, if he had property, had a right to dispose of it as he pleased (consistently with the laws of his country): He must have had a legal right to have given it *all* away, because it was his own—certainly then he had a right to give away a *part;* or lay on the whole a *perpetual* incumbrance. And it is equally clear that if, after giving away a part, or perpetual deduction, he left the remainder to his descendant, that remainder was all such descendant could have a title to—that however the division was made, or to whomsoever a part was given away—whether to a layman or an ecclesiastic—or on whatever account, is nothing at all in this question,—for such ancestor pretended no scruple of conscience against maintaining a priest—perhaps in so doing he might think he did his duty:—And it is most certain, that a man's ancestor, who lived 500 years ago, could have no idea of being ever charged with attempting, in the disposal of a part of his own property, to dispose of the

property or the conscience of a man who might possibly be born, and possess the remainder, 500 years after him!

But such sort of reasoning as Joseph Phipps's may nevertheless, in the opinion of some worthy members of our society, be a match for any *worldly wisdom* that can be brought against it; and be sufficient completely to overturn, or as far as argument can do it, the whole fabrick of tithes!—

Seventhly, Notice must now be taken of what our friend had before said, (Brief Remarks, p. 13) which, if just, would preclude the use of all argumentation from reason on the subject of tithes. It is this—"He (the Quaker) takes the land simply as "he finds it, and where it has the incumbrance of "tithes upon it, he comes under no obligation with "his landlord, actively to pay them, because it is "against his conscience to do it; but for conscience-"sake he peaceably suffers them to be taken from "him."

This seems to go upon a supposition that the Quaker is sometimes so much in the simplicity, as to make it no part of his enquiry, whether the land he takes be titheable or not; (which, by the bye, some people might consider as no very just notion of a Quaker at a bargain) or otherwise that his conscience, be the incumbrance on his farm what it may, will be sufficient to bear him out against acknowledging it. Joseph Phipps, however, uses the qualifying word *actively*, as though the Quaker yet considered himself as at liberty from his conscience to pay tithes, should there happen to be any, *some other way*.—On the whole, tithe-payers are rather puzzled to make out any clear connection of ideas in the above passage; but they certainly think, that if one of them take his land "simply as he finds it," and *finds it titheable*, it is his duty *simply* to pay the tithe, whoever be the legal receiver.

NEITHER are they fully satisfied, that their non-paying brethren, who take farms on leases, do not, in common with them and other tenants in like cases, actually bind themselves, by the terms of their leases, signed with their own hand, "to bear, pay, "and discharge, all rates, assessments, payments, "and incumbrances, of what kind soever, which "either now are, or hereafter shall be, laid on the "said premises, land-tax and quit-rent only ex-"cepted:" this being the substance of the common clause usually inserted in leases—from which it is presumed those of Quakers do not vary.—They are therefore utterly at a loss to find out how it is that a Quaker "comes under no obligation with his land-"lord *actively* to pay;"—*passive payment* they "cannot understand, even with the help of Joseph Phipps's *animadversions*, "*about it, and about it.*"

To strengthen this plea of conscience, by shewing the incumbency of faithfulness in conscientious matters, and that laws are complied with by *suffering*, Joseph Phipps (see Animadversions, p. 51) has brought in the cases of the decrees of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, and the consequent sufferings of Shadrach, Meshech, Abednego, and Daniel. But tithe-payers seem utterly at a loss how to make the application. They find that tithes were *originally* instituted by divine authority, and for a most worthy purpose, viz. that those to whom they were given might be exempted from worldly cares, and be able to dedicate their lives to the spiritual exercise of religious offices, for the service of others; that by their means the one supreme, only wise God, might be the more honoured and adored: They consider tithes in the Christian Church as standing, if not on the same full authority, yet on the common consent of the people, for the very same purpose:—They have no doubt but many who have been supported by

tithes (notwithstanding the defection of others) have conscientiously devoted their days to the service of men, have been blessed in their deed, and have rendered the institution subservient to the cause of God, notwithstanding many instances to the contrary: But when they consider the decrees of those tyrannical kings, they are constrained to think *them* founded in the grossest ignorance of the truth, and a presumptuous disposition to give law to the souls of men, regardless of (if not contemning) the authority, of the Almighty God—giving a God to the people, and requiring their adoration! Tithe-payers *cannot* see any agreement in these cases; and therefore think it hard that they should be censured for what they cannot help: But if they could think them not totally dissimilar, yet as they disclaim all *idolatry*—ungifted as they are with the miraculous faith—they may hope to be found on the side of Shadrach, Meshech, Abednego, and Daniel.

They find some difficulty also in giving their non-paying brethren credit for *peaceably suffering* the tithe to be taken from them, when it is evident that without an actual assault on the claimant or his agents, they could not very well do more than they do, in open opposition. For if the tithe, on a non-paying Quaker's land, be legally marked out, and the claimant's title to it thereby exercised, yet if he cannot be first in carrying, he will find his authority resisted by the Quaker's taking away the whole. Such conduct may appear *right* to non-payers of tithes; but tithe-payers are of opinion, that by peaceably suffering the tithe to remain on the field, after the law of the land has fully taken it from them; instead of taking it away, in open defiance of that law, to the certain trouble and probable vexation of the owner, they might with more *colour* of justice call themselves *peaceable sufferers.*

EIGHTHLY, Having so far stated the different views of those who pay, and those who profess a conscientious testimony against paying tithes, I am to introduce some new matter, which must be left for the consideration of those to whom it belongs.—Our tithe-payers, after long consideration of the subject, find themselves utterly at a loss to reconcile the seeming inconsistency that appears among the *faithful* part of our society, in professing a religious scruple against an hireling ministry, and against tithes to support it; while they so readily, yea without the least hesitation, pay an additional land or other tax, when imposed ever so expressly for carrying on *wars and fightings:* As though the Christian religion were less dishonoured by the unrelenting lust of ambitious princes—the desolating plans of projecting ministers—and the sanguinary progress of hireling destroyers, than by hireling ministers of peace! Tithe-payers have considered this subject as a most interesting one, and have sought satisfaction with much solicitude. For though in the whole New Testament they find no commandment against the payment of tithes and ecclesiastical demands, they find the Christian religion uniformly represented as a religion of love, of brotherly kindness, and forgiveness of injuries. Consequently, as they think, a testimony against wars and fightings, and a positive refusal to pay taxes for the carrying of them on, must be abundantly more defensible on the Christian precepts, than a refusal to pay taxes for purposes professedly religious and peaceable. They have read, indeed, and it has been told them, *We have a testimony against wars also;* why then so *inconsistently* pay to the support of them? If it be replied, as it has been again and again, "that "we have the example of Jesus Christ (who paid "tribute to Cæsar) for paying kings, or government "taxes, and are bound so to do by his injunction,

"*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;* "—that we are not accountable for the *abuse* of "tribute paid for the only purpose of *righteous* go-"vernment;" let it (say our tithe-payers) then, be said aloud, and let it be heard with attention, that the preambles to acts of parliament, as well as the circumstances of times, often tell us plainly enough *what new taxes are levied for:** That even Cæsar, or government in any country, has no claim of tribute, but what the original compact or standing agreement of that country give it: Such is the ground of claim, and such the obligation to pay. This original compact and standing agreement are equally the ground and support of tithes; therefore, in a legal sense, are equally due. All the difference lies in the *nature of the object;* but that difference is against the Quaker—For, while he readily contributes to the waging of war, he refuses legal aid to the professors of the gospel of *peace*!—

To CONCLUDE, The various contents of this pamphlet being now finished, I most respectfully take leave of my readers.—I have wished to plead for righteousness and Christian charity, as the ground-

* The examples of the present unhappy times† are judged sufficient to confirm this truth. And though this be not a place for enlarging on politics, the tithe-payers (who have not always an opportunity to be heard) will be glad to have it told, how unaccountable it is to them, that some of those deemed *faithful* brethren not only pay their quota of the new public assessments, with the utmost readiness; but indirectly deal out their *approbation* of public measures: They are astonished at the strange inconsistency of human nature, when they consider with what pretended holy zeal *some* such men will carry on their spiritual censure, against a poor tithe-payer, for his unchristian practice; although, unaccompanied by them, he can shudder at the loud cry of innocent blood; and, with the Christian fervour of the virtuous Falkland, exclaim, "Peace! peace!"

† In the midst of the *American* War.

work of all happiness in religious society—unmoved by passion—but with a plainness becoming the sacred cause of truth. I have wished to evince, by that plainness, the necessity of paying a less regard to external profession, if we would avoid the promotion of formality, which ever enfeebles—and hypocrisy, which ever disgraces, a religious community. —I do not pretend to determine whether the pleaders for the payment of tithes and ecclesiastical demands have, in the foregoing pages, uniformly proved that truth is on their side; that point—or whether they have fully proved that truth is not with their opponents—I leave. The wise and dispassionate will judge for themselves; and such, however oppressed, have always a comfortable appeal to the Judge of heaven and earth; although when the unity of the church is broken, and the ornament of the temple of God is rent away, they cannot but deplore the sacrilege! But the narrow-minded and over-bearing, against whom they have so much sorrowful cause of complaint, I must finally refer to the following passage of Robert Barcláy.—"And for our "parts we are very willing that all our doctrines and "practices be tried by them (the scriptures) as the "judge and test; and we shall also be very willing to "admit it as a positive certain maxim, that whatso-"ever any do, pretending to the spirit, which is "contrary to the scriptures, be accounted and rec-"koned a delusion of the devil."—Apol. prop. 3. sect. 6.

Now, if the advocates for church censure, in the matter before us, can prove that the work which they have been doing—their setting reputable, worthy, and pious men at a distance as evil—treating them as offenders against God—and refusing to have brotherly communion with them, in a society wherein they were born, because they cannot see the affair of tithes in the same light as themselves; and thereby

making them uneasy, and unhappy in their connections, as well as laying a strong temptation before them, to get into new connections of a dangerous kind: If, I say, they can prove all this to be justified by Scripture—or if they can bring any New Testament authority at all, for requiring a conformity to their principle respecting tithes—I shall be ready to admit that R. Barclay's sure *test* will not condemn them. But if they cannot (as I believe will be the case)—then, as they regard their own interest in the peaceable kingdom and world to come, it behoves them to consider the *delusion they are under;* and bowing to the humility of sackcloth and ashes, seek mercy while it is to be found.

FINIS.

A SHORT DETAIL

OF

INSUING OCCURRENCES, &c.

BY W. MATTHEWS.

THE foregoing Treatise on *Discipline* was written by an old friend and correspondent of mine, Henry Portsmouth, of Basingstoke in Hampshire; — a man of great respectability as a practitioner in medicine, as a scholar, and as a Gospel Minister among *Friends*.—He had suffered much infelicity and pain of mind, for many years, on account of the liberality of his sentiments on religious subjects, and especially from what he had observed of the narrow and intolerant spirit of which he complains in his Treatise. From the intimacy which subsisted between *us*, he confided the perusal of his manuscript to me,—desiring my opinion as to the propriety of publication. I was too much of his mind in many particulars, not to encourage the idea of printing the Tract, and undertook to superintend the press, at Bath, on his behalf. While this task was under my care, it struck me that a particular *addition*, under the head of *Tithes*, might be seasonably made, and properly annexed as a Postscript. On communicating to him my ideas, he expressed sufficient confidence in me to be willing that I should make such addition in any manner I might think

most proper. And as our sentiments on the topic in question so nearly agreed, as to induce me to think I should express the substance of *his* arguments, by holding the pen in his absence, I resolved to write in the character of the Author of the first part of the book; and did so, without communicating the Postscript to him, till he saw it in print. And I had soon after the satisfaction to find that he was well pleased with what I had done. The Pamphlet thus finished was no sooner published, than it occasioned much enquiry, in the Society, after the author; and though some persons suspected it to be the work of my Friend, I did not altogether escape the imputation. Few, if any, that I knew of, suspected that it was otherwise than the production of one pen—and as such it was soon replied to by the then Society-writer, *Joseph Phipps*, of Norwich; who sent out his remarks and censures upon it, in two separate pamphlets, printed by James Phillips in London;—and though many copies were given away by the liberality of the Society, with a view to counteract unsound opinions; I suppose both tracts are yet to be purchased, with others of the same author, on the same subject, at the house of William Phillips, the printer's son and successor.—This I mention, that it may continue to be known that answers, purporting to be complete refutations, were given to the piece. The judges, however, of their respective merits, must be left to form their own opinions.

The suspicion of my being the author seemed, after some time, to increase, although certainty was wanting:—and though I was not restrained by *fear*, from avowing the facts as they stood, I had thought it unnecessary to do so, and hoped that the service of the attempt to diffuse liberality of sentiment, might be somewhat increased by preserving the secret.—But my growing dissatisfaction with some articles in

the discipline of *Friends*, induced me shortly after, to take such publick steps, in my own person, as led to the conclusion, that if I was not the author, I was completely of his school; and as the event soon proved, was no longer to be tolerated as a member of the society. Indeed my mind had been so much affected with the subjects I had *privately* complained of, that in comparison of the satisfaction I expected from an *open* avowal of my sentiments, a formal rejection by the body, or rather by the ruling individuals in the district of my residence, was become a matter of very inferior concern. I therefore soon thought it most right, deliberately and calmly to *oppose* those rules of discipline, in several particular points, which were strenuously exercised in the Monthly Meeting:—And soon after this, determined to discontinue my attendance of meetings for discipline altogether. My resolutions of this sort I signified by a particular letter addressed to one of the elders,—and shortly afterwards in one, written more circumstantially, and at considerable length, to two others: Not wishing, however, to *provoke* a separation—but expressing my willingness to remain an independent member of the Society, so far as such a character might be admissible. It is true I could have small expectation of this—and I soon found, of course, that *none* could be entertained. The particular series of *treatment* received, and of my conduct under it, I forbear to detail at length in this place; both because it is of too *personal* a nature for me now to dwell on,—and because those acquainted with the common process of what is called *dealing* with supposed delinquents, will sufficiently anticipate the substance of the intercourse. I was not hasty in the discontinuance of my publick ministry at Bath, where I reside, even after a minute of rejection from membership had

been recorded in the Monthly Meeting book; both because I found the spring of love frequently flow in my mind towards my little audience, and because the far greater part of them had signed and sent me a written testimony of their regard for me in that character, with hopes that it might continue. But my knowledge of the consequences, to *them*, of exposing, determined me to conceal, their names. Many of them are now dead, or removed to other situations. The *constitutional* irregularity of continuing my publick appearances, was a sufficient inducement to me soon to desist:—and it was not long before I found myself most disposed to discontinue also a regular attendance of Friends' Meetings.

A man educated, habituated, and principled as I was, is very unfit to find satisfaction in the communion of any *other* religious society; and I have hitherto found more content in remaining a solitary retired character, than in resuming religious attendances among those, whom (though I very affectionately regard them) I cannot have full unity with, as a body. Mere external appearances of fellowship produce but little satisfaction on either side:—And yet there are situations in which I might find more freedom, than where I now reside, in associating for the purpose of publick worship, under the form peculiar to our Friends—and to which I am strongly attached on account of its simplicity, and the solemnity of its design.

It may possibly be queried, Why, if I am so far from feeling an immediate *interest* in embracing the society of my friends, near me, for the important act of publick worship, I should feel so much as I appear to do, for the reformation of the practices of the general body?—And it *has* in fact been repeatedly queried, why such persons as I am, cannot be content to let that body quite alone?—My answer is two-fold. I still retain my general liberty of ma-

king such remarks on the religious and civil economy of *any* particular society, as I think proper to make, with a view to their and the general advantage:—And I feel a particular inclination to do this, towards the society of *Friends*, in proportion as I know and love many respectable individuals among them; and as I feel a strong partiality for the *chief principles*, by which I think the body ought to be mainly and properly distinguished. These reasons may account for my now introducing some extracts, from an "Explanatory Appeal," which I published, "to the Society in general, and my Friends in particular," in 1783, being the year in which my separation took place. Passing over the *introductory* and more *personal* parts of that little Tract; I shall begin, as follows, with that part wherein I adduced my arguments, on those points which were the chief subjects of dissent between my disciplinarian brethren and myself.

First; Then, *as to the subject of marriages out of the society*.

I am by no means an advocate for mixed marriages; and as I have often declared, am sorry when I see them take place. When the choice of young *men* leads to them, I feel a regret that they should voluntarily turn from the society in a matter so important, and slight the opportunity which they mostly have of connecting themselves with young women who have a kind of claim on their preference, and who are generally as amiable in themselves, and as well qualified to make good wives, as any in other societies. Not but that great allowances are sometimes to be made for marriages, which take place in consequence of particular circumstances, as *incautious* and *gradual*, rather than *premeditated*, fixing of affections. And indeed, wherever the affections of a young woman of another society appear to have been engaged by one under our name, I conceive a

difference of religious profession is by no means a sufficient reason why we should attempt to *prevent* such a marriage, as some from an intemperate zeal have done; and if not to *prevent* it, by consequence not to *disown* the party for marrying, or for not professing afterwards his SORROW for having so married.

In the case of the marriage of young *women* out of the society, I frequently feel a particular concern; for I believe it seldom happens that young women, virtuously and properly educated among us, marry out, from a *preference* of such a connection; but because, perhaps, of a want of those exterior recommendations, *wealth*, or *family*, now so much regarded among too many parents, as well as children, from whom better things might be expected: Or because, it may be, of a constitutional weakness, tenderness, or bias of nature, which, in them, the sense of religion itself may be insufficient to extinguish or correct. Others having been fashionably educated in a stile and manner superior to their parents' circumstances, must not marry little tradesmen, or unsuitably to their improper education. Thus being made unfit for one station, and being too poor to rise to another, they naturally become exposed to temptations from the world, which they find it doubly difficult to withstand.

To such may be often applied the words of the Apostle,—They "shall have trouble in the flesh;" but having broken no command of God, merely by the act of marriage, it seems the duty of the true church rather to "spare" them, than consider such marriages as a *sin*, and proceed to *punish* by disownment; especially where a disposition remains to frequent the meetings, profess the general principles, and remain in the connection of *Friends*.

A DECLARATION of REPENTANCE is what, in such a delicate situation, I think, should never be sought for, or stand as a condition of the church's

excuse; for let theorists in discipline say what they will, it lays a temptation to *insincerity*, or (that which is ever to be guarded against) unhappiness between the parties.

The Church, being the stronger body, should *bear;* being the body in which most Christian tenderness is supposed to dwell, should *shew it forth*. It is the *weakness* and the *error* of her children, not their *strength* and *propriety of action*, which call for it.

To steer wisely in this matter, the Church, in the amiable character of a mother, I think, should ever lean to the side of tenderness; seek to foster and keep, rather than cast off her children; shew forth an uninterrupted spirit of love and forbearance towards them, and leave the event of her admonitions to the Divine Providence; and, at least, wherever there is no matter of *scandal* in the case, "judgment" to whom it belongs!

I know the sentiments of not a few among our friends on this subject, that *tenderness*, sometimes called by them *foolish pity*, is but a kind of *cant term*, very commonly, but improperly, made use of by those of an opposing libertine spirit; but that a just regard to the purity and authority of the Church is incompatible with such notions of tenderness. To such persons I would embrace this opportunity of observing, that it was not alone for the sake of rebuking the disciples who were with him, upon a certain occasion, that our mild and merciful Lord said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are "of." The record was for future instruction, and the words have lost none of their weight. To such persons I would just say, it is well for them and me, that *fighting* principles are not in their Creed; and that they have not the temptation of power and religious zeal united!

One principal objection, frequently urged, even by the more moderate, against abolishing that part

of our society system, beside the supposed *irreligion* of mixed marriages, is, that thereby our present plan of separately maintaining our poor, would soon become embarrassed, and almost impracticable.

To this, many are ready to answer, that hard indeed is the case, when natural rights must be invaded, to support a system (though in some degree of a charitable kind) which is not necessary to the being of a truly Christian church: For there was no *such* establishment in the first ages of Christianity. And for my own part, I am seriously of the belief, that under the discretionary care of *Deacons*, furnished with means from *voluntary* contributions, (which was the practice of the primitive churches) the poor would be as well provided for, while more genuine scope would be given to the generosity of some of the wealthy.

Thus would all *compulsion*, by the systematic authority of one meeting over another, in matters of property, be avoided, which would prevent some instances of discord; and every thing being *voluntarily* carried on, aided only by weighty *advices* to generosity and tenderness, the work of common charity would have in it more of the freedom and benevolent nature of the Gospel. And so far as we may be a people seeking the *power* more than the *form* of godliness, the Divine Providence, under which all good deeds are directed to their proper uses, would doubtless be a sufficient direction to those immediately concerned in administering to the necessities of the poor and needy; not according to any stipulated rules of allowance, but more according to the calls of particular cases; and without the unnecessary and unpleasant enquiry about exactness of religious principles, and freedom from human errors, which must now so often make the poor professor the proper object of the church's bounty.

To conclude on this subject: There is a wide difference between general brotherly admonitions, to marry with persons as nearly as may be of the same religious principles; and the bringing of "judgment" and excommunication upon those who use their natural and moral, if we may not also say, their *Christian* liberty to the contrary. The first is the spirit of love; the last, I cannot but think, must have another name!

SECOND; With regard to *claims for the support of a national church.*

Under this head, I am to consider how far we, as a people, appear to be right or wrong, in requiring uniformity of *opposition* against the laws of the land, under the supposed sanction of Scripture doctrines.

Far be it from me to *decide* upon the point of faith, that any man is wrong in *believing* that he ought not to pay tithes. Every man in his present state of imperfection must believe as he can, and is undoubtedly right in acting, so far as concerns himself, according to his own most clear belief. But "Let every man (saith the Apostle) be fully persuaded in his own mind." And again, "Whatever is not of faith is sin." And be it here fully noted, that I blame not the most orthodox professors among my brethren for their *belief*, so far as it may be clear to themselves,—nor their consequent conduct in their *personal* capacities.

But I have a testimony of strong disapprobation, against the practice of *assuming a Church Authority*, and *requiring assent, under penalties of any kind*, in those matters of faith which admit, and must ever admit, of doubting and disbelief, in the minds of many sensible, thinking, and pious persons: Persons who may, nevertheless, in my humble opinion, cordially embrace all that is essential to a Christian communion among us; which *all essential*, I presume to think, may well be deemed to consist in—

1. A belief in the doctrine of *inward revelation;*
2. The non-necessity, under the Christian dispensation, *of human rights in divine worship;*
3. And the benefit of a *silent waiting upon God* in our religious meetings.

These three grand points of belief seem to me fully sufficient to place us as a people in such a state of harmony, as to qualify us for the main purposes of religious association among ourselves, while they would unquestionably distinguish us widely from every other religious society in the world. And whoever shall fully believe in these points, which were leading ones in the religious conviction of our forefathers, is *essentially* a Quaker; and, in my serious opinion, ought to be considered and received as such, notwithstanding any possible doubts which he may have, respecting other and more outward matters, whereby he may be deemed by some "weak "in the faith."

It is evident that there were points in which the first Christians did not exactly agree, and points of such supposed magnitude as were likely to cause dissentions among them. But, said the wise Apostle, "Him that is weak in the faith receive, but not to "doubtful disputations."

Contrarily to the spirit of this wise and liberal doctrine, too many under our name seem to be laying down an unscriptural principle, that all men, to be rightly religious, must be guided by the unerring spirit into a *sameness* of views and belief. Their general reason is, that Christ is not divided, but speaks the same thing in all; and their inference is, that where there subsists a difference of opinion in any thing which the church has happened to adopt, there must be unfaithfulness to the uniform and unerring principle.

Self-righteousness here gets on the accusing side, and says, "Mine is the sound faith,—thine is the

"unsound: Thou art the disobedient, thou art the "delinquent." A principle this, and a consequence this, which our society most unwisely and unhappily exemplifies among its more busy disciplinarians, who, generally speaking, are persons either of narrow capacities,—of a sordid uncontemplative turn of mind,—formal professors, or persons of a timid and superstitious spirit; who therefore rise not to the liberality, and mental dignity of religious understanding.

My reasons for being so fully dissatisfied with our articles of what I call *assumed Church Authority*, under the present head, are of two kinds; they shall be plainly set down in order, and then let the serious, intelligent, and impartial, judge.

1. Because it may admit of a reasonable doubt in the minds of sensible and enquiring persons, (and a doubt too, which neither tradition, nor the mere belief of others, can remove) whether we have a right, as individuals, to withhold, or shew a disposition to withhold, if it were in our power, *tithes*, or other demands, claimed by virtue of the laws of the land in which we live? For, as a matter of *legal* right, it may be strongly argued, that before a man can be warranted in refusing to pay a demand, of whatever kind, made upon him, it is necessary for him to prove that the thing demanded is clearly, positively, wholly, his own, and not another's.

Now by the law of *nature* alone, it is clear that, under God, the great proprietor of all creation, a man's body and mind, being the proper constituents of himself, are, with his thoughts, simply *his own*. But things, *ab extra*, are not *naturally* his own; nor are they any further to be considered as such, than by virtue of the laws of that common society, whereby all outward things are vested and secured on established conditions;—and those especially which are agreed on for the common interest and security of that common society in which a man lives.

Thus, what a man labours or gives a deemed equivalent for, according to established and common conditions, becomes his own by virtue of *those conditions;* and by virtue of them he possesses a right of giving or transferring such things to another, but not otherwise.*

Now, with respect to the kind of property in question, viz. *tenths*, or *tithes* of possessions, it will be deemed necessary by some to enquire, whether those tenths of property, or other demands of a church kind, are in their nature different from, or are a part of, those things which the laws of common right and security, proceeding from the supreme earthly power, have recognized and settled? And in this point of view, the sensible, unprejudiced, and impartial examiner, generally sees it, as a matter of fact, that such tenths or tithes have been fully declared, established, and settled, by virtue of the aforesaid supreme earthly power in this country; and the common consent, usage, and interest of the people.

Hence it may seem to follow as a consequence, that individuals, who collectively make the people, and who in all matters of property are necessarily enriched or impoverished by general laws and common usage, (aiding or controling their exertions, and regulating accidental circumstances) are bound to conform, and as peaceable subjects *actively* to conform, to those general laws and usages, which operate on all, and are intended to affect all alike. In the affair of *tithes*, for instance, all are considered as *equally* bound to pay, independently of differences in religious sentiments, because, in a *legal* point of view, all have received value. And if all have not received *an equally calculated value*, precisely exclusive of any superior skill and exertion of

* I do not here mean to enter into the question, Whether an individual would or would not have had such rights previously to the establishment of society?

any particular individuals; still have all received *such* value by the regulation of the laws respecting the land, and its produce, as the spirit of the general laws, so affecting all, has *deemed to be value*.

To oppose such a regulation, a man must either proceed on a principle of *resistance*, which is the foundation of *rebellion;* or he must neglect to fulfil the laws from a conscientious persuasion of duty to God: But the former will not do for us as a people; and the latter can only be justified on the supposition of an impulse on a man's own mind, superior to all reason, and all human obligations. But this impulse being wholly within a man's self, in his own single experience, does not, and cannot, affect *another*, by so affecting *him*. And as it is not in the power of man to command it, (admitting it ever so good in itself) I think the possession of such an impulse, or (to use our own word) *testimony*, should never be considered as the *test* of an orthodox and necessary faith.

If we advert to the *origin* of those claims, distinguished by some as *ecclesiastical*, and by them contra-distinguished as a-part from, and inferior to, the ordinances of a civil jurisdiction; we shall not find that origin to have been clearly in any ecclesiastical authority in this country. And therefore, reasoning from historical evidence of undoubted credit, a disbeliever in the *right* of refusing to pay tithes, because of their standing chiefly on the bottom of civil authority, has undoubtedly much to say in support of his sentiments. He pleads in plain terms, that tithes, or tenths, are not *legally* the property either of the *owner* or *occupier* of lands charged with them; but lie, as to their operation, as a rent-charge on all such lands, for a declared and generally acknowledged purpose; and that from a period *antecedent* to any title which either the tenant or proprietor is likely to have had in them. For that the great Sir Edward Coke upon Littleton, lib. i. cap. 9, sect.

73, recognizing the laws and ordinances of antient kings, and especially of King Alfred, lays it down as a fact, that "the first kings of this realm had all the "lands of England in demesne, and *les grand* ma-"nors and royalties they reserved to themselves, and "of the remnant they, for the defence of the realm, "enfeoffed the Barons of the realm with such juris-"diction as the Court-Baron now hath, and insti-"tuted the freeholders (such as they themselves so "made) to be judges of the Court-Baron."

It does not seem material for us to enquire here, *how* those antient kings *gained* such ascendancy and possession: It is sufficient for our purpose to know that they *did* so; that their supremacy and authority were acknowledged, and became the source of power and right from which every man derived his future title; became also the source from which the laws of England, respecting future divisions of property, received their existence, and their different operations. It is sufficient for us to know, that in those times, when all the lands of England were the King's demesne, the tenths or tithes of the land were set a-part by the kingly or supreme power; and consented to, and ratified, by the Barons and Freeholders; and in that state were bought and sold, inherited and bequeathed, from generation to generation. And that they *were* so set apart, may appear from the charter of *Ethelwolph*, the second of the Saxon race, and son of *Egbert*, who reduced the heptarchy to the dominion of one king; which charter, among others, is universally acknowledged, and recorded to have been extant in the ledger-book belonging to the Abbey of Abingdon, in the year 1648.

Thus it is made to appear, that all the lands in this kingdom were charged with the tax of tenths or tithes, by the kingly or supreme authority; which being ratified and confirmed by the unanimous practice of succeeding kings and lords posses-

sors, the title of the clergy to those tenths as *wages*, which the civil power thought proper to allot, for the supposed general good of the kingdom, to subjects of their description, was a part of the antient law and usage of the land.

This may be further made to appear by a law of king Athelstane, made *anno* 930; about which time, it seems, the barons, and even bishops, holding lands of the crown, began to think of considering such lands as their own sole exclusive right, and to dispute the payment of the tenths to the church; for this law commanded all the king's ministers throughout the kingdom, that in the first place, before bringing any of the profits of those lands reserved to the crown for the use of the crown, they should deduct and pay the tenth for the subsistence of the church.

Thus also were all the bishops obliged to do by lands which they held of the crown as annexed to their churches; and all the nobles and officers by the lands which they held in property as their own possessions and inheritances.

And whatever national changes may have since taken place in English laws respecting property, inheritance, and tenure, by the Norman conquest, the convulsions of the houses of York and Lancaster, the abolition of the Pope's influence, the seizure and sale of church lands, &c. this one point is clear, that the lands *in general* were never disencumbered of their tenths or tithes; nor any authority exercised to render titheable and church lands of equal value to the owner; so that whoever bought lands, having tithes payable out of them, undoubtedly bought them at a price lower in proportion to the estimated amount of the incumbrance which had been imposed, and remained as a standing tax upon such lands Whoever succeeded to them by inheritance, or received them as a gift, received them in the same

state; and whoever bought or received the appropriated church lands, which were tithe-free, received them in their state of distinction and superior intrinsic value. The same argument universally holds with regard to those who rent; consequently it must, from the foregoing premises, appear reasonable to most persons, who calmly and fully consider the subject, that however *erroneous* with respect to the pure spirit of Christianity, and consequently however *unnecessary* the national tax of tithes may have been; however the amount may vary according to the various modes of cultivation used at the pleasure of the occupier; still he remains legally bound, by the same authority whereby the *possession* of the land is conserved to him, to submit to this tax; and that not by refusing actively to pay, and so *suffer* the penalty of *distress*; but by *paying actively*, in submission to the powers that be. Such is the common and common-sense reasoning of some of our brethren, upon a matter about which so much unpleasant division has taken place.

And I cannot but be of opinion, that a person, for the foregoing reasons, may think it right for him to pay tithes so demanded of him, and yet have a sufficiently strong *testimony* in his mind against the *principle* of an hireling ministry.

2. Because it may be thought especially reasonable by others, who advert to the submissive and peaceable spirit of Christianity, as laid down by our Lord himself, that however they may disapprove of the *lucrative* establishment of a national clergy, and the luxury and irreligious indolence of some of that order; yet, as the kingdom of Jesus Christ is not of this world, nor his peaceable religion to be maintained by strife about outward things, they are bound to regard, in this matter, the apostolical injunction, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for "the Lord's sake;" well knowing, that by not op-

posing violence (if for argument's sake, the national tax of tenths be violence) they should have no hand in promoting that violence; and therefore will have nothing to answer for on that account: at least nothing more than by submitting actively to pay many other national taxes, levied in time of *war*, and perpetually known to be laid for carrying on the evil work of shedding human blood!—A work mostly begun and pursued in the wickedness of human pride, and that lust of revenge which stands directly opposed to all Christian purity;—a lust coming from the influence of the Prince of Darkness, and of all abominations!

Many will continue seriously to believe, that if, for the sake of national order, and submission to national authority, they must pay in the one case, they are at least as much obligated, in the character of simple Christians, to pay in the other.

I am fully apprized of the force of all the distinctions which have been made between these claims and the grounds on which all taxes, not for the use of the clergy, are admitted, as right and proper to be paid by a peaceable Quaker,—who is said to have no business with political disquisitions. But many think, that a time will come, when so full a submission in one case, and so full an opposition in the other, will be found to make but little of the genuine consistency of the Christian character!*

* It seems to have been weakly, if not erroneously, argued, that other reformers besides ourselves, have borne their testimony against ecclesiastical claims, as antichristian, and unlawful in a Christian church.

John Wickliff, for instance, seems to have been misrepresented in this particular; for though he was an eminent and zealous reformer of many abuses, and indeed exclaimed loudly against the grand apostacy of the Romish church; yet doth it not appear to me that he ever was principled in the unlawfulness of paying tithes. Had that been the case, he would have proclaimed the universal principle of right in every man, on resisting principles, to refuse supporting the

Others, who consider the example of Jesus Christ, as set down, Matt. xvii. 24. will think themselves

temporalities of the clergy. But if ever he did this, the proof of it has escaped me, and he must not be very consistent with himself; and I think myself warranted in concluding, from various written evidence concerning him, that he held no such principle. The principle which he held forth publickly was this: "That *kings, princes, and lords temporal, may* "*lawfully take away temporalities and tithes from the* "*clergy;*" which seems to have been a principle more levelled at the enormity of power, and abuse in the church of Rome, than at the existence of tithes, as originally settled in the professed Christian church. At all events, his reasoning, (which I shall adduce in support of my opinion) as contained in his answer to king Richard II. who asked his opinion about the lawfulness of seizing ecclesiastical possessions, will not bear adoption by our society. And as this opinion was given near the close of Wickliff's life, it may suffice to shew how far any authority can be drawn from him, in aid of the singularity of our testimony.

"It rests (says he) to prove the affirmative part, by the "principles of Christ's law thus: Every natural body hath "power given of God to resist against the contrary, and to "preserve itself in due estate, inasmuch as bodies without "life are endued with such a kind of power, as hardness to "resist those things that would break it, and coldness to "withstand heat that would dissolve it. Forasmuch then, "as the kingdom of England, after the manner of phrase of "scripture, ought to be one body, of which the king is "head, and the commonalty are the members thereof: It "seemeth the same kingdom, head, and members, hath such "power given to them of God, and so much the more appa-"rent, by how much the same body is more precious unto "God, adorned with virtue and knowledge: for so much "then, as there is no power given of God unto any creature "for any end or purpose, but that he may lawfully use the "same to that end and purpose; it followeth, *that our king-*"*dom may lawfully keep back and detain their treasure of* "*temporalities and tithes, &c. for the defence of itself, in* "*what case soever necessity doth require the same.*"

Again in his 13th article: "It is not only lawful for lords "temporal to take away goods of fortune from churchmen, "sinning usually, but also they are bound so to do, under pain "of *eternal damnation.*" But all this, I trust, is foreign, in the letter and spirit of it, from peaceable Quakerism.

warranted in freely paying, if not absolutely called on to pay, those demands, rather than "offend," and occasion strife. They will read the passage, and consider the subject thus:

"And when they were come to Capernaum, they "that received tribute-money came to Peter, and "said, Doth not your Master pay tribute? He saith, "Yes.—And when he was come into the house, "Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, "Simon? Of whom do the kings of the earth take "custom, or tribute; of their own children, or of "strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. "Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. "Notwithstanding, *lest we should offend them*, go "thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the "fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast "opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of mo-"ney. That take, and give unto them for me and "thee."

It was a custom among the Jews to collect of all their nation, by means of officers appointed for that purpose, an annual tribute of about fifteen-pence per man, English money, for the service of the temple. Our Saviour being, as to his human extraction, of the Jewish nation, though so generally spoken of as a divine character, it seems to have become a question at that time, whether *he* would, or would not, pay, like other Jews, that tribute?

Our friend, Anthony Purver, indeed, has translated the original word, above rendered *children*, differently, and made it *subjects*,—as though it had been intended by our Lord to argue from the legal obligation of *foreigners*, and *not subjects*, to be tributary to the kings of this world; but seems to have had a wrong conception of the doctrine of this remarkable transaction. For though it should be granted that the word υἱῶν will bear such a rendering

as *subjects*, yet in this place such a translation seems to do violence to our Lord's argument. To prove which, Peter's reply, "of strangers," would, on such a supposition, be entirely wrong. For it is most certain, that subjects are *not* excused from paying tribute to the kings of this world, they being the very persons who *do* pay;—and in general, *strangers*, as opposed to *subjects*, are the persons who are *not expected* to pay.

To give this passage of our Saviour's conduct its due notice, let us attend to the obvious sense in which it will doubtless continue to be considered by many under our name, as well as others.

Our Saviour, as *Son of God*, took this opportunity to reason the ground of *his* title to be free from a tax professedly raised for the service of God, in keeping up the outward and formal service of the temple. It seems remarkable, that though a principal part of his mission was to turn men from outward and ceremonious, to inward and effectual, religion; and respecting the temple, he went so far as to speak to his disciples of a time then approaching, when that temple should be thrown down, and not one stone left upon another; yet was this no sufficient reason for him to set his disciples an example of *resisting* and *offending* the Jews, in a matter wherein the purity and inward vital religion of the *heart* was not concerned. "What thinkest thou, "Simon? Of whom do the kings of the earth re-"ceive tribute—of their own *children* or of *stran-"gers?*" [Those who are not their own immediate children, but the members of other families.] "Peter answered, Of *strangers*. Then, said he, "are the *children* free." And, by a plain consequence, I, who am the *Son of God*, who is the supreme King, or King of heaven, must have a natural and eminent right to be free: And my disciples, my *brethren*, who are spiritually the *children* of my Fa-

ther, being brought into the experience of that spiritual religion and worship, which consist not in the outward service of "*temples made with hands,*" *might* plead some privilege to be free also. "Nevertheless, *lest we offend them,*" thou shalt pay this tribute for us *both*. And that there may be recorded a remarkable instance of my conformity in these matters, and the liberty and non-resisting spirit of my religion, I will even on this occasion work a *miracle* to perform the payment expected. "Go thou to the sea," &c.

As an additional proof that this was not, as some have improperly supposed, a tax levied by the authority of the emperor, for the civil purposes of the Roman state, (which would have made it far less a case in point) the name of *publican*, or the proper officer for collecting the foreign taxes among the Romans, is not once mentioned or implied in the passage: It seems evidently to have been a *Jewish* affair, and the authority that of the *high-priest*.

Again; the piece of money found in the mouth of the fish appears from the text to have been the *stater*, a Jewish coin, which, according to the tables, is equal to two half-shekels, and exactly made the tribute proper for two persons, according to the Jewish law, (Exod. xxx. 13.) for the support of the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, and the after temple.

Now, about the import of the doctrines of Sacred Writ, as well as about other things, many and opposite are the opinions of serious men, under different religious distinctions; and some may be found to disapprove the sense in which I have considered the foregoing passage; while others will assert its insufficiency to countenance a Christian Quaker in *actively* paying at this day what are called ecclesiastical demands. I am content just to say in answer, that I am satisfied with the sense which I have

set down; and consider the liberty implied in our Lord's conduct, for the regulation of his church, as of more importance for the regard of disciplinarians, than all the opposite authorities of *men* united.

The ingenuity of man, and the working of a religious zeal, are capable of giving a multiplicity of constructions and opposite senses to the same doctrines; and hence the diversified opinions, and systems, and confusion, which make up the religion of the professed Christian world. But if one society would become a pattern of greater wisdom than another, it should turn as much as possible from the systematic spirit, which in religion is most commonly the spirit of error, and simply look up to the *oracle;* weigh well the simple tendency of his teachings, which were wholly directed to the reformation of the heart; regard the universal reception which those persons met from him, who were in the spirit, the teachable spirit, of *tenderness and love;*—and regard that sacred benignity, so emphatically implied by these words: "Whoever shall do the will "of my Father, which is in heaven, the same is my "brother, and sister, and mother."

To sum up my sentiments of the discipline and internal establishments of a Christian church. I think that every religious society, professing to be Christian, (whatever may be its peculiarity of mode, in approaching the altar of God to perform its devotion) should consider itself as not warranted in imposing or setting up any article of faith, or of religious communion, which is not expressly contained, or clearly implied, in those doctrines which Jesus Christ, the wisdom of his Father, and the divine authoritative head of his church, has given forth in the Holy Scriptures. I think that so far as any religious society is found in the contrary spirit, of imposing or establishing any articles of belief, or things necessary for practice, which are *not* so expressed or

implied, is departing from the character of a Christian society, and partaking of the nature of an arbitrary and political body. It is the privilege of a national assembly, or commercial and political club, to give itself rules, and bind and expel its members according to their own *prudence;* but a religious and strictly Christian body, like a Christian individual, has the latitude of its essential principles already prescribed, and cannot go beyond it without giving up its name. And so far as it refuses to tolerate an individual, in declaring his mind respecting what he believes to be its deviations and errors; and evinces a spirit of resentment and punishment, to the extent of its little power; so far it appears to me to be in the spirit of PERSECUTION.

From what I have said, especially under this last general head, it will be obvious to every candid and ingenuous reader, that it is not my object to *censure* any, living or dead, for refusing, or having refused to pay tithes; or for attempting, or having attempted, by open argument, to *convince* others of the duty of so doing.* Though it seems to me plain, that wherever our friends have undertaken to establish, *by argument*, a reasonable right in individuals, of refusal to pay, they have been generally considered, by judges of argument in other societies, as having failed of success.

We have, indeed, a living writer,† who has taken much pains on the subject; and though in point of solid argument I am not alone in thinking that he

* And that I may not be unjustly suspected of being a friend to the principle of an hired ministry, in these Gospel days, I do hereby solemnly declare, that I think no man wishes more ardently than I do, that tithes and church claims were abolished by national decision; and that if any religious society should continue to think such ministry necessary, they should be at full liberty to judge and act for, and only for, themselves, in that behalf.

† Joseph Phipps.

falls below his talents, and that he assumes a degree of confidence to which he has no right; yet must it afford pleasure to the most sensible and ingenuous part of our society, that our controversial stile, as shewn by him, is considerably improved since the last century; for among some of those called our *antient* friends, the cause of truth seems to have been often but ill served, and the meek and patient spirit of Christianity but poorly exemplified.

I have no pleasure in casting a reflection upon a single character among our predecessors: I know they had an arduous day of trial—while their principles, in the main, were fully opposed to the spirit of irreligion. But when it is become so altogether orthodox to attribute almost all wisdom and excellence of conduct indiscriminately to *them*, it may not be improper to guard the unwary against supposing that those were the days of infallible doctrine, and unmixed truth. The subject now under our consideration seems to have been one of the most difficult which they had to manage. And surely small is the wonder, that priests should have been often disgusted when they read our arguments, and observed the spirit of them. I would just give an instance, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions:—

A writer on the subject of tithes, having used the well-known argument, that after a national separation of property, and the general appropriation of the tenths by the supreme authority; the people, or land-owners, could not be said to have any right in the tithes: Therefore comes this reasoning in answer:

"A strange assertion! The like to my knowledge
"I never met withal! What, not concern the con-
"science of a Christian, whether the tenth of his
"labour, industry, and all he has and enjoys by the
"blessing of God, be given up to the praise of his
"Maker, or to the Pope, Priest, Belial, Devil, who

"will take them? I do really demand of thee to "search all the dark and hellish traditions of the "Jews, that made void the law of God, and all the "decretals of Popish counsels, and prelatical synods, "since the apostacy, and find the like instance of "ATHEISM!"—*

Far be it from me to insinuate that *all* their arguments against tithes were in the same *stile;* but they generally went on the principle that the claimant had *no rights,* and therefore came in the character of a *plunderer.*—How incorrect and unwarrantable such ideas are, I trust has been fairly made to appear.

My great object has been, and is, to plead for the necessity, the Christian necessity, of such *a general toleration,* as to exclude all compulsion or censure, respecting the points in question, which I conceive to be points *not* made necessary by the doctrine of Christ, or his inspired Apostles; and to be unfounded in the *consistency* of religious truth, as adapted to the outward economy of the militant church of Christ. And I believe till such a *reformation* (for I deliberately call it so) shall take place in our society, we never shall be an internally, quiet, flourishing, and happy people.

Some of our body, I know, will be pained at such a free declaration of my sentiments; and I am pained at the thoughts of giving *them* uneasiness,—for I have no life in augmenting the infirmities of human nature: But nothing short of plain unequivocal expressions can be suitable to the fulness of my persuasions,—and therefore I send them forth.

* Thomas Rudyard.

☞ *The following article may serve to exemplify the narrow, bigotted, and mischievous spirit, which becomes tolerated and fostered in the society of Friends, by the continuance of the* mistaken Christian Testimony *with regard to* Tithes. *It requires very little comment, and therefore I give it nearly as I find it printed.*

AN

EXPLANATORY ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE CALLED *QUAKERS,*

And to the Candid of every Denomination.

IT has been well remarked, that next to the satisfaction arising from the *consciousness* of rectitude, is that of possessing the esteem and good opinion of one's *friends,* and of those amongst whom it is our lot to live. Under the full conviction of the truth of this sentiment, we are induced to offer to their notice a brief explanation of the circumstances prior to, and attendant upon, a late event; which if it be considered as affecting *us* only, as individual members of a religious community, will probably (as it must have come to their knowledge) have excited a wish for some elucidation of a matter, which cannot but appear, at present, totally enveloped in mystery. We address ourselves to our

friends, whether members, or not, of the particular society from which we have been lately expelled, under the persuasion that truth is not confined to a sect, and that it will find advocates in the well-informed and the liberal of all denominations; and we trust they will be enabled, without difficulty, to determine, whether or not our conduct has been the result of those principles, which we conceive to be inculcated by the religion of the Gospel.

For the information of the candid enquirer, who may not be acquainted with what is generally termed the *discipline* of the Society, it may be useful to state, that it has long possessed a variety of rules, either formed by the Yearly Meeting, or collected from its former epistles and advices; a part of which may be considered as tending to preserve the purity of the moral character of its members; and the other part, as having in view their consistency with regard to sundry scruples, commonly known among them by the distinction of *Testimonies*. This discipline is administered by the Monthly Meetings of the members; who, from local situation, being acquainted with the circumstances of those cases that come before them, have always exercised, and must necessarily exercise, a certain degree of *discretion* in the execution of their duty. In the case of which we are now to describe the outline, it will be seen that these preliminary observations were not altogether unnecessary.

The Monthly Meeting of Reading had, for some years past, consisted of a small number of persons, who, if not exactly of the same sentiment in some matters relative to the application of this discipline, had usually conducted their concerns with a Christian forbearance towards the opinions of each other; and if, at any time, a matter occurred of sufficient importance to require, in the opinion of any mem-

bers, the excommunication of the party arraigned, this final measure (beyond which there remains no farther power of censure, and no superintendance of conduct) was seldom—we believe never—adopted, unless with the concurrence of *all* the acting members present at such meeting. Such was the practice of the Monthly Meeting of Reading, and such we understand to have been the *general* practice of the society at large.* But of late, we are sorry to assert, a spirit of bigotry—perhaps a love of power, frequently accompanying the delusive idea of the possession of superior illumination and ability for the management of church affairs,—has made its appearance in our little body; and under the fair and plausible pretext of maintaining the church pure, by supporting its discipline, has used every effort to stretch that discipline to its utmost, in certain cases, —principally, but not wholly, in that of TITHES. It happened that a member of the meeting had been dealt with (or visited) for the payment of this demand, and it was proposed to exercise the rod of discipline upon him on this account. We could not concur in its exercise in this particular instance, partly on account of the very reputable character of the man (to say nothing of his right to the exercise of private judgment), and partly on account of his having a large family; who, we believed, it required no great sagacity to discover, would be naturally involved in their father's situation with respect to religious communion;—and to those who know the case, it is unnecessary to say, that our prediction was not wide of the truth. Our objection, however, was fruitless; for though he was not at

* Perhaps this point may be questioned; but certain it is, that, however intemperate some zealots respecting the *testimony* against *tithes* may be, it is not a *common* practice to excommunicate those deemed *unfaithful*, but by the concurrence of the greater part of the meeting.

that time excommunicated, the measure of excluding him from meetings of business, and refusing to accept his contribution to the common stock, was adopted:—a measure which is generally taken to be preparatory to a total disownment.

By this instance of intolerance, we found ourselves so entirely indisposed to unite with the ruling party in the *spirit* of their proceedings, that some, though not all of us, declined the attendance of the monthly meeting; which continued till some time afterwards, when we heard, with a degree of astonishment not easily expressed, that the meeting had agreed upon the disownment of two other of its members. This measure, though agreed on, was not to be carried into effect till the following meeting; and we felt ourselves impelled by every consideration of the regard we bore to the society, as well as to the individuals concerned, to attend that meeting, and to make a last effort, by preventing the final adoption of this unjust proceeding, to save our little meeting from ruin, and the society from disgrace on its account. It is not requisite to state the allegations brought against these two members, because there was not the least attempt made to impeach the character of either; yet we may briefly mention, that the first was charged with absenting himself from our meetings for worship, though he had stated his reasons for so doing, to arise from the pointed and offensive *ministry* of a man, who has since *disgraced himself* in the eyes of his late supporters.* To the

* By a shameful *insolvency*. This, it is worthy of remark, has been no uncommon occurrence, but a very frequent one, in the history of what is called *free ministry* among the *Friends*.—It is not wonderful that it should so happen to great *zealots*, who spend much of their time *from* home, depending on Providence, through substitutes, for the management of worldly business.—The good *Apostles*, by simply following their *fishing* and *tent-making*, being content with very simple *food*, and with goat and badger skin *raiment*,—

other was imputed the payment of *tithes;* which, however irreconcileable with the strict interpretation of certain rules of the discipline, has seldom, or perhaps never, subjected the party to the penalty of excommunication, unless it has been called for by other attendant circumstances; and such did not attend this case. On every ground, therefore, we could not but highly disapprove of this attempt to raise the rod of correction; and we steadily for several hours, and during two sittings of the meeting, persevered in our disapprobation of it, offering all the reasons that occurred to us, drawn both from the former and general practice of the society, and the Christian forbearance due from brethren of the same peculiar church; as well as from the universal charity required of all those who profess the Christian name. We were also joined in our disapprobation by one of our esteemed *elders*, who expressed his sentiment early in the course of the debate. Will it be believed, that notwithstanding, as we have before observed, the character of these members was not attempted to be impeached, their *excommunication* was determined on? Will it be believed, that though the number of those who opposed it was nearly, if not quite, equal to that of those who resolved to carry, and who *did* carry it, their opinion was treated with

and not objecting, occasionally, to receive *voluntary* assistance,—it is presumed seldom, if ever, became bankrupt.—*Our* professed *prophetesses*, who seem now to be our most numerous movers in divinity, are generally secure from bankruptcy, because mostly aided by parents, or under coverture of husbands. But our *men*-ministers should not be encouraged to depend on a *miraculous* power in the common hazards of human affairs:—It has been proved to be *enthusiasm*, in too many instances.—The case is difficult, and likely to remain so!—We may well suspect the *general* principle is carried too far to be quite *safe*,—unless, indeed, it be better to suffer a little occasional obloquy and publick scandal, than alter a jot of the mode of exhibiting a *free*, *inspired*, and *apostolical* ministry!—EDITOR.

neglect, if not with contempt; and they were charged with making a party to obstruct the proceedings of the meeting? And yet this is precisely the case. We may here appeal to the experience of those who are conversant in these matters, on the question, whether in any meeting, however large, (and much less in a very small one) a measure of this magnitude was ever ventured upon, with the dissentient voices of *five* of its acting members? We believe not. But though we failed in the object of our endeavours, it is worthy of observation, that it was so plainly apparent, the act in question could not be described as the act of the meeting that the clerk was directed, at our request, to insert in the minute of disownment, our names as dissenting therefrom; and this dissent, as a part of the minute, appeared upon the books amongst the proceedings of the day. We shall have occasion to allude to this point in the sequel.

In what a situation were we now placed? As members of the society, to give up all interference in its concerns, was inconsistent with our usual habits, and not altogether agreeable to the ideas we had long formed of the duties we owed to each other, as individuals of the same religious denomination. But to act with a set of men, whose principles had been shewn to be so diametrically opposite to our own, was utterly impossible. It was also unmanly to attend their meetings, and without taking an active part in the management of such matters as came before them, to sit quiet spectators of the scene, and to give thereby a tacit consent to their proceedings. The only alternative, therefore, left us, was to withdraw ourselves wholly from their meetings of business; and in doing this, as well as withholding our contributions from their stock, (a measure we found ourselves called upon to adopt, by frequent specific allusions, and the most pointed observations of the zealot before alluded to, who was now become the

leader of the meeting) we believe, on mature consideration, we pursued the *only* method in our power, of expressing our entire disapprobation of the *spirit*, as well as the *letter*, of their conduct.

In this situation the affair between us continued for some time, but it was too much to expect that it should continue long. An examination of the history of most religious institutions will convince an impartial enquirer, that the governing party seldom suffer the rules and orders of their own particular church, however intolerant, and however repugnant to the pure spirit of love and concord, to be treated with contempt, or even with neglect. The ruling party, therefore, applied to what is termed a superior meeting (or a quarterly meeting of the county), alleging that its *weak* state required assistance; and the quarterly meeting deputed several of those, whom it appeared to deem the most *discreet* and the *wisest* of its members, to attend their meeting, and afford the aid required. We were, therefore, soon assailed with notice, that a visit was intended to be paid *us*; and we received this, and several others, jointly; in which we took occasion to state to them our reasons for absenting ourselves from the monthly meeting. We may also mention in this place, that we never refused to confer with them upon the subject whenever required, though we thought it improper to consent to receive visits individually; lying under no charge of having infringed any rule of the society; and conceiving ourselves as united in the same public cause, and acting more as a body of men, on behalf of the general interests of the society, than for any particular interest or advantage of our own. Yet we were considered, and reported to the quarterly meeting, as *refractory* members; and in one of their visits we were informed, that that meeting had directed the monthly meeting to expunge from its records that

part of *its own minute*, expressive of our dissent from the measure then agreed on. But who does not see, that by this most arbitrary decree the records of the monthly meeting become mutilated, and no longer express its proceedings on that day? Who does not see also, that the quarterly meeting assumed a power which no such meeting possesses,—that of altering the records of another meeting? By the same stretch of power they might have ordered all its records to be burned.

These visits were repeated from time to time, and became somewhat troublesome, till at last we explained to our visitors the terms upon which alone we could meet them in society-union; and requested we might not be treated like children, amused continually with useless trifling; but rather considered as men of some maturity of understanding, and as having acted not without previous deliberation. We also delivered to the last deputation we met, a paper expressive of our intention to draw up a statement of the grounds, upon which our conduct had proceeded, addressed to the monthly meeting; which we prepared accordingly; but before the day of its delivery, notwithstanding our intention was known to the meeting, we received by the hands of two members the following testimony of disownment; which we print, not for any excellence in its *grammatical* construction, but that it may explain the ground of our sentence, in a shorter and fuller way, than we may, perhaps, do in a greater number of words.

"Whereas Henry Finch, John Harris, sen. Joseph Morris, and Robert Harris, members of this meeting, have been long laboured with, in much love and tenderness, to reclaim them from that spirit of opposition to the rules of our discipline, which hath long prevailed in them; and as the labour so

bestowed *having* proved ineffectual, we believe it right to testify against such disorderly members, and declare we can no longer own them as members of our society: Nevertheless we do sincerely wish they may be brought to a true sense of their error, and be again restored to membership with us.

"Given forth at our monthly meeting, held by adjournment at Reading, this 6th day of the 10th month, 1797; and signed in behalf of the same by

"WM. OSMAN, Clerk."

On this curious paper it is obvious to remark, First, That it does not impute to any or either of us, any impropriety of conduct, either in our individual characters, or as members of a particular sect; and, Secondly, That it does not contain any charge, upon which, even according to their own rules, disownment can be founded: Yet, in the excess of their zeal, have they ventured upon an act unauthorised by their own law. Thus is our fate decided; and though we are far from imputing to men who perhaps feel not (or are not aware that they feel) the spirit of *persecution*, a disposition for the further extension of church-power, we felicitate ourselves, and those who may hereafter happen to fall into the same circumstance, that the power of the ruling party in any church, however small, is *limited*. We would, however, observe, that though we cannot acquit the leading party in our own particular meeting of imprudence in commencing the late proceedings, and of intolerance and injustice in their progress, yet we are inclined to believe, they would not have gone the lengths we have been describing, if they had not been *favoured* with the assistance of a committee from the superior meeting, to which they applied; and it is to be presumed that such committee was formed from among the *wisest* of its members! We refer to their *actions* for the fruit of this *wisdom*;

and proceed to observe, that admiring the liberal spirit of genuine religion, evidenced by the temper and meekness of its professors, and abhorring the appearance of spiritual tyranny under whatever form, we feel, perhaps in greater force than before the late event, the importance and the necessity of the exercise of private judgment; and we must resign the principles we have long entertained on this subject, before we can agree in sentiment or in action, with those, who, to use the words of a most judicious author, "converse but with one sort of men, "read but one sort of books, and will not come in "the hearing but of one sort of notions. The truth "is, they canton out to themselves a little *Goshen* "in the intellectual world, where light shines, and, "as they conclude, day blesses them; but the rest "of that vast *expanse* they give up to night and "darkness, and so avoid coming near it." *Locke's Conduct of the Und. Sec.* 3. We speak only of those in the society, who appear actuated by the narrow spirit of endeavouring to reduce its members to one scale of action, not by the enlarged and liberal method of enlightening the understanding, but by extending the discipline to its utmost bounds, without reflecting on the ground upon which the society was first established; and without making allowance for the variety of circumstances by which the opinions of mankind are formed, whilst their leading principles may agree, in the main, with those of a particular sect. However it is our business not so much to *censure* as to *explain*; and we conclude by appealing to the candour and good sense of our friends, whether of the society or not, requesting them to weigh the circumstances we have laid before them; and making little doubt, that if we do not appear entitled to praise for our exertions, we shall, at least, derive the satisfaction of knowing

that, in their opinion, WE HAVE ENDEAVOURED WELL.

JOHN HARRIS, sen.
JOSEPH MORRIS.
HENRY FINCH.
ROBERT HARRIS.

READING, *Nov.* 24, 1797.

☞ Thus were four moral and reputable men cut off from membership in a society in which they had been educated, and a kind of stigma attempted to be fixed on them; for what?—For having endeavoured to prevent the exercise of a mischievous constructive authority, which no church on earth, on Christian principles, had any right to assume!—It is possible that by appeal to the yearly meeting, they might have obtained the redress of *re-instation*, upon the merits of their particular case; but while the general principle of coercion was known to be, in their opinion, so strong and improper, they could not resolve on the *trouble* of any further contest. Strict alliance with such a church (I speak from experience) had lost its amability!—The last of those four friends, respectable at once for his moral and religious character, and from his station in life, was so much hurt at such abrupt and intolerable conduct towards him, that he entirely left the connection, and joined the Church of England. Some of *her* tenets, of course, he could not approve, and he had been cordially attached to the best principles of the *Friends:* But in the state of mind to which he had been driven, it seemed to him better, on the whole, to turn from such a sect to the quiet, erroneous as it might be, of the national church, rather than bring up his children in a discordant connection, wherein the treatment he had met must excite their indignation.

EXTRACTS FROM THE

SECOND PAMPHLET OF CATHOLICUS,

Printed in 1798.

☞ *Having myself become a solitary member of the church universal, though in principle a sincere member of the society of* Friends, *(so far as I judged their principles should extend) I have remained for many years a sort of* non-descript * *among my brethren.—In the year* 1798, *when the demands of government for enormous war-taxes became a subject of universal consternation, the situation of our orthodox* Friends, *relative to those taxes, forcibly struck me:—And as it seemed a fair opportunity for again contrasting their scruples against paying tithes, with those more extensive and equally unchristian demands, which they paid; I sent forth a pamphlet entitled* "A new and seasonable Address to "the People called Quakers, relative to Tithes and "Taxes." *Some copies remain, and may be had gratis of the Author; but I shall make, in this place, such* Extracts *as may serve to shew the substance and tendency of the pamphlet.—I do this with the less scruple, because though some of the arguments may appear like* repetitions *of parts of the foregoing pages, yet they are neither long nor useless, in exemplifying that inconsistency of conduct, of which I complained. I therefore begin at the 9th page of the 8vo Edition.*

I HAVE in substance joined, and am ready to join in principle with you, that the imposition of tithes, or any other means of maintenance for a set of men, appointed, or to be appointed by human

* By the courtesy of the Bishop of Rochester, this term has been applied to *methodistical* church-people, who will not forsake wholly their mother church, lest out of her there

authority, to teach a particular set of dogmas, doctrines, creeds, and ceremonies, as the true catholic or Christian faith, is altogether unwarranted in primitive Christianity, and totally repugnant to the freedom of the Christian religion. I have no scruple in affirming my belief, that *tithes*, so imposed, should be considered as an anti-christian yoke upon civil and religious society: that any government, so imposing or confirming such a yoke, acts with a high degree of political error: that such a government, in a professed Christian country, acts with a still higher degree of inconsistency with the nature of Christ's religion—consequently I can have no difficulty of believing, most sincerely with you, that in this country the existence of a tithe system is an unwarrantable grievance.

But when we bring tithes to the test of Christian purity, condemn them by the simple standard of truth and righteousness which our Lord sat up,—and maintain that, because so condemnable, they are at all events, and under all present circumstances, to be resisted *in toto*; we act partially and inconsistently, unless we advert to the purity and righteousness of his laws in all other publick matters, and square our conduct by the same rule. This I state as a general principle, without an adherence to which we cannot lay a valid claim to consistency of religious character.

Nothing can be more clear than that the vital spirit of Christianity is totally repugnant to *evil provocation, revenge, violence*, and the *military mur-*

should be no salvation! I am not actuated, however, by any such fears. And it may be useful just to record here, that though on many occasions I have been called to pass the *judicial test*, since the magistrates and legal men near me have been well acquainted with the *exterior* separation between me and my friends, I have never found the least objection raised in or out of courts, against my *affirmation* as a Quaker.

der of armed hosts! But these are practised in professed Christian countries with as much promptitude, as though they were the real duties of the Christian religion! I know you lament, in much heaviness of soul, this miserable defection from the true dignity of men and Christians! Could universal love and peace be established by your prayers, or your sufferings, I know you would rejoice "with "joy unspeakable." But the time of this perfection in society is not yet come!—and though the enormities in question could not be carried on without the contributions of the people,—I do not say that under the general precept of "submission to "the powers that be," (because *the power, or general principle, of government, is ordained of God*) you or I are warranted in refusing to be taxed, among other objects, for purposes of war!

You seem to have agreed, and I will not controvert the *general* principle, that in matters of government, however inclusive of taxation for war, you are to be active in your submission. But I must, and do, most seriously contend, that uniformly and actively to comply with demands of this nature, *known to be stained through and through with blood;* and yet to excommunicate your own members for paying *tithe*-demands, in obedience only to the laws of the same government,—is a dilemma of inconsistency, from which the power of *reason* cannot deliver you! You will perhaps reply, or think you can effectually reply, that *revelation*, and not human *reason*, is the higher and the authoritative source, from which you draw your distinctions. I would gladly find you supported (for I wish all credit to be on your side) in this high appeal. But let us examine the general conduct of Jesus, respecting these matters. Did he *prohibit* the existence of tithes, as a source of ministerial maintenance in his church? No; but he shewed, by example and precept,

how his religion might be taught without any temporal emoluments—and thus left an example, that men should follow his steps. Did he *prohibit* the raising and use of offensive or defensive armies? No; but he taught the doctrine of love, forbearance, suffering, forgiveness of injuries; and shewed how mankind, by loving one another, by overcoming evil with good, and doing to others in all things as they would be done unto, were bound to *preclude* the use of swords and destructive weapons! Thus he made clear the civil duties of all who would be his disciples. He did not *expressly* prohibit temporal emoluments in matters of religion—not because he did not foresee that such an inroad was in danger of being made upon the simplicity of his sacred ministry—for this, we may well believe, must have been clearly known to him:—He did not *expressly* prohibit the sanguinary contentions of earthly powers; not because he did not foreknow that they would be in danger of so violating the divine morality of his sacred doctrines—for this, doubtless, was also foreknown by him:—but in the contemplation and foreknowledge of human error and obduracy, he laid down this general doctrine—"Wo unto the world, because of offences; for it must needs be that offences come; "but wo to that man by whom the offence cometh." This was said, not merely respecting the man who should betray him to death, though it be considered by some as applicable to that sinful event; but it was evidently a general principle, in a few memorable and solemn words, applicable to the publick offences of men in all generations—a principle harmonizing with the simplicity and purity of the Divine government, to the end of the world.

I believe with you, that the perversion of the Christian simplicity in the article of a tithe-supported ministry, is an *offence*—and that to those concerned in the origin and continued legal impo-

sition of that perversion is applicable a just proportion of the "wo," by which "the offence cometh." The degree of the "wo" applicable to this, among the numberless impositions and "offences" which take place in the affairs of men in society, we cannot, and it is not in our province to do it, fully comprehend. Infinite wisdom alone is equal to it; and as that wisdom exists in union with infinite power, purity, and mercy, we are sure that universal and perfect retribution will be finally made! Neither we, of this generation, can be answerable, nor could your ancestors have been answerable, for the *offence* of the imposition in question; it was settled by national authority, long before we or they existed: and it is not in our power or province, as peaceable Christians, to control the laws, or annul by resistance the statutes respecting the divisions of property.—They must remain, as they have been settled and transmitted, till in the order of Providence, which governs all events, they become reformed by legal consent; or till a power of *subjugating* reform arise, which you, consistently with your peaceable principles, can have no pretensions to organize.

I know it is a favourite, and I doubt not a sincere, opinion, of many of your members, that your refusal to pay tithes, and your active conduct in carrying away the whole titheable produce of your lands, as *wholly* your own property, whenever you have opportunity so to do, is a length to which you ought to go, in dereliction of the authority of an erroneous institution: And that by such conduct you are discharging a kind of Christian duty, which, aided by your consequent prosecution and suffering, will have a gradual influence towards the rectification of national error, in the tithe-establishment. On the other hand, you profess to believe, that the *different*, and as you term it, "unfaithful conduct" of some of

your brethren, who act on an uniform principle of submission, is an impediment to the progress of reformation. But, however satisfactory your conduct may be to yourselves, and however flattering may be your expectation of the success of it, be assured, for the fact is certain, that not one reflecting man in a thousand, of other religious persuasions, thinks you warranted, on the principles of *common justice*, in urging your "testimony against tithes," by the mode, and to the extent, which your society has adopted, as of Christian obligation. The abolition of tithes, whenever it shall happen, will be effected by other means than those which you exert, on the plea of conscience, against the legal claimant. In the publick mind, so far as you stand acquitted at all for such conduct, it is on the ground of erroneous *prejudice*, and erroneous *zeal*.

In the recent instance of the imprisonment of several of your members in York-Castle, their honest *zeal* might be allowed, and doubtless was admitted, by most candid persons, who think favourably of the general simplicity and professed integrity of your society. But I have no difficulty in declaring my belief, that very few indeed could acquit the sufferers of *erroneous prejudice*. Their adversary, however, was far more the object of general censure, and most deservedly so;—for his conduct was in the very spirit of *persecution*. The legislature, long before he existed, had, in tenderness to your supposed sincerity, provided the easy means, by justice's warrant, whereby he might have been satisfied in his legal demands; and in so doing, had tacitly prescribed his mode of procedure. He chose the most severe, unchristian, and oppressive line of conduct—and justly rendered himself the object of general indignation. The unwarrantable, unrelenting severity of this priest—his arrogation of merit, instead of taking shame to himself—and his meanness

in publickly cringing for a reward of his iniquity, cannot be too much reprobated by the honest part of mankind.

The question respecting the non-payment of tithes, as it stands between you and the publick, has been fully discussed, at different times, by different and by some disinterested writers. In a *postscript* to a former pamphlet on Church Discipline, and on a subsequent occasion, I, as one of the latter description, have given my opinion. It would therefore be the less necessary for me in this place, to enter again at any considerable length into the subject, were such a discussion a main part of my object. Most of your own writers have appeared to confine themselves chiefly to censuring the conduct of clerical *receivers*, and the hardships your society has suffered from the unchristian spirit of those receivers. For such a complaint we know there has been too much cause. But your most able and eminent writer, Anthony Pearson, may be considered as having early comprised in his book, whatever could have the nature of argument, either on the erroneous origin of tithes, or your adopted mode of testifying against them.—What has been said on those topics by your lesser writers, among whom Joseph Phipps is chiefly distinguishable, might perhaps have been better omitted,—for what Anthony Pearson could not do, was not reasonably to be expected from an inferior pen.

Anthony Pearson has fully shewn, and exposed to general disapprobation, the error of a tithe-establishment in a professed Christian church; the blindness and superstition of the first promoters of it; and the fulminating craft and hypocrisy of regal and priestly power, by which a general division of the value and produce of lands became effected; by which a tenth, or a nominal tenth, was set apart, in

a way most unwise, unworthy, and perplexing; and by which provision was made for perpetuating a class of men, who, as such, would be a standing obstacle to the simplicity of the Christian system; and who, from the worldly motives by which many of them would of course be actuated, must furnish a standing contrast to a genuine Christian ministry!—All this he fully and forcibly did; and in so doing, he marked out the ground of a *rational dissent* from a church so founded; of an abandonment of her communion; and of those strong testimonies, and remonstrances to government, against a burthensome mode of support; which, if honestly persevered in, may be ultimately successful.—But even Anthony Pearson has not shewn how, on any principle short of *resistance against the laws of the land*, and an invasion of the *legal* rights of other men, any individual subject, be his religious opinions what they may, can insist on taking, as his own, the whole produce of titheable lands!—[The reasons *why* he cannot, I trust have been fully and conclusively stated.]

An honest and industrious cultivator of land (of any religious persuasion) may be an aggrieved and suffering man, by the operation of the law of tithes upon his superior *industry*, or *costly, experimental modes of exerting it*; and this has often happened, to the injury of the general interest, as well as his own; but it is an *accident* of the subject, by no means chargeable on the tithe-claimant, and altering not the ground of his right to receive. It is, however, an accident, which from its nature will be found of increasing weight in this country; and which will have a progressively powerful tendency towards the removal of the burthen of tithes, if they should never be *forcibly* overthrown in the first resentments of a public *convulsion*. Such a termination of tithes, as by the latter mode, would be on a far different principle from that on which you pro-

fess to object to them, and on which you hope for their end; and I will do you the justice to say, from my full conviction of the truth, that you would be *behind* the last to attempt an abolition by such means.

Indeed your principles of peaceable submission, and attachment to the civil governments under which you have lived, both before and since the Revolution of 1688, have been always remarkable. You have addressed your submission and allegiance to all the successive princes on the throne—and in all civil matters have appeared emulous to be considered as loyal, contributing to the expences of government as far as your professed "testimony against wars and fightings" would possibly allow you to be active. This disposition you particularly evinced, by your voluntary contribution for flannel waistcoats to the army of the North, while repelling the invasion of 1745. That contribution was well received by government; while it was considered by some persons as bordering on a temporising conduct,—and of late years, as not according with the strictness of your assumed "testimony" against the support of a *militia*, for a specific provision against invasion, and for home defence.

However equivocal your conduct in these matters may appear; however reconcileable, or otherwise, with the *strictness* of your testimony against paying a tax, which government had long before settled on your lands, for the support and *clothing* of priests; you never before were called upon for contributions, equally large, definitive, and trying, with those of the present period!* The present period seems to

* In 1798, when a *triple* assessment of government taxes was levied; but which was soon after repealed, to make way for a general tax on *Income*, for carrying on the most wide and expensive plan of *war*, that ever this country saw.—It is not, however, to be understood that I lay more stress on the *magnitude* of this unhappy war, than on the radical evil

have been reserved by a wise and superintending Providence, for bringing the rectitude of many men, and many measures, to a close and serious test. In this general trial of rectitude and consistency, you are deeply involved. Your ground of action, in comparison with that of some other descriptions of men, is indeed apparently simple and contracted; and much confined within the sphere of your own society. But you have a part of some importance to act: your wisdom and *consistency*, in the conjuncture, will be of some consequence to your credit in the serious part of the world; and more particularly so, respecting your own internal government, and the "testimonies" you profess to bear.

You are now called upon to pay *large* contributions, not for the *general* purposes of regular and ordinary civil government, but, *avowedly*, for the *specific* purpose of carrying on *war;* and a war, too, which has been, beyond all former example, sanguinary and destructive to the human species!—Tithe-demands you hold to be contrary to the spirit of the religion of Christ, inconsistent in their origin, and, as you think, in their tendency, with the simplicity and disinterested love of that religion; and therefore you refuse to pay them. This refusal you ostensibly hold to be your bounden duty as Christians, notwithstanding all legal authority, and all the interwoven rights of possession and allowance, without which, as has been clearly shewn, you could not have possessed at all.—You expressly advert to errors in the origin, and in the tendency—ground your "testimony" on them, and raise that "testimony" above all law, and all human obligations. In these partial professions I doubt not the sincerity of

of the war-principle; or that I call on my *friends* to do so: But when the enormous evil of that principle is so mournfully exemplified, it becomes proper to argue from the horrid *consequences*, as well as from the principle itself.

many among you, whatever I must be allowed to think of their *prejudices* and their *consistency*.—But if you feel it your duty to refuse a compliance (or, as you term it, an *active* compliance) with the laws of the land, that you may not be chargeable even with indirectly aiding what you suppose the law of Christ is against; how will you *consistently* pay, with active hands, in common with the abettors of war in general, and of the present most melancholy war in particular, whatever is demanded of you under the head of "the Assessed Taxes" already imposed, and those others which will doubtless be soon imposed, for the express purpose of continuing *this war* with increased vigour?

That *war* has been the assigned and real cause, and specific waste, of more than nine-tenths of all the money that has ever been raised by taxation in this country, is too obvious to be denied! and the heads of numerous acts of parliament, passed for raising new taxes in times of war, have sufficiently told you so; but that "the Assessed Taxes," *now* demanded of you, are *precisely* for the purposes of war, and no other, permit me to transcribe the following words of the title and preamble to the act itself:

"ACT FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AN "AID AND CONTRIBUTION, FOR THE PRO- "SECUTION OF THE WAR!

[12th Jan. 1798.]

"MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN!

"*WE your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal "subjects, the Commons of Great-Britain in Par- "liament assembled, feeling it our indispensible "duty, at the present crisis, to provide effectually "for raising the supplies, which are requisite to "defray your Majesty's publick expences in the "prosecution of the just and necessary* WAR *in "which we are engaged, &c. &c.*"

Here the object is not of a doubtful nature; but distinctly avowed, clear and unequivocal.—In paying these taxes, who does not see that you yield a direct obedience to a human law, which virtually calls for a suspension of your "testimony against "wars and fightings?"

You do, indeed, enjoin your members to refuse an active payment of *militia*-money, when demanded of you as such, in lieu of bearing arms, for home-defence. So far your conduct is *consistent* with your original scruples, in the matter of *tithes*; but the much larger demands upon you, *expressly* for the purpose of more offensive, general, and, as you well know, of destructive and sanguinary warfare, you comply with, without any *apparent* scruple at all. And *comply you must!* But in this part of the statement, I will not permit the supposition to rest for a moment, that you are *intentionally* friends, directly or indirectly, to *any* kinds of warfare;—I know the contrary to be the very truth: you mourn, as real Christians, over such misery of human nature!

I know you profess not to make political matters the subjects of your society discussion—or to appreciate the merits, or comparative demerits, of national quarrels, and war policy. You profess to be under the superior government of the Prince of Peace, and to have nothing to do with questions of carnage and destruction. But such questions have now much to do with your pockets, and the exemplification of your principles.

And yet, such is your situation, that under the general injunction to *submit yourselves to the ordinances of the ruling powers that be*, you cannot refuse to pay the *legal assessments*, without incurring penalties, which you will not consider yourselves as called on to incur! In your case,—the whole is a series of implicit *submission*, either with or without a rational construction of general obe-

dience. The situation may be painful, and doubtless you have felt it—but you must and will, on the general principle of submission to government, *pay and submit!*—Neither do I see how you can continue your customary censure and excommunication of those who, in *active* obedience, pay the specific demands for raising the *militia!* Any shades of difference which you may attempt to define, in favour of paying the new "assessed taxes,"* you will henceforward so attempt, with small satisfaction to yourselves; and in the estimation of other men, the most accustomed to reason correctly on general matters of importance,—your arguments to that point must utterly fail. Permit me, therefore, briefly to repeat, and urge, for your consideration, what my leading reflections were mainly intended to impress, that, as you must find yourselves involved in augmented inconsistency, by *now* imposing on your own members, as you have done, your society laws, relative to tithes; you would wisely relax from that *unnecessary, unhappy*, and I wish I could not truly say, *unchristian* severity: a severity which you cannot, without the most glaring absurdity, continue to prosecute—and which all you have written, or attempted to say, in the style of rational argument, is wholly insufficient to palliate!

The true friends of the Christian religion cannot wish to see you abandon the *rational* part of your "testimony against tithes"—a testimony, which, to a certain extent, must do you honour, and the holy Christian cause a most essential service!—But that testimony, to be Christian,—to be most consistent, impressive, and beneficial,—must be bounded (as your professed testimony against wars and fightings) by a publick and solemn, often proclaimed, but *not*

* The same reasoning applied afterwards to that enormous call, the *Income Tax*,—which was *substituted*, professedly on the same *war-principles*.

contentious and *persecuting*, disapprobation of their existence!—This you may nobly continue to do, by shewing forth *an example* of their non-necessity, in a well-ordered Christian church, edified and instructed by a disinterested, primitive Christian ministry,—by public and seasonable appeals to the consciences of the people in general, and particularly to the ruling "powers that be," for the truth and excellency of such principles, and such practice.—On such open, and truly Christian ground, after the example of Him, who taught, admonished, intreated, and wept, for the salvation of men, you may humbly trust that your light will not be lost; but that it will so shine as, under the supreme government, to become subservient to the great ends of the gospel!

Such a conduct, unaccompanied by internal coercion in matters of the mere economy of your faith, would be attended with at least all the good effects which your present practice can produce; and be abundantly more prevalent in its general influence.—Such a conduct, instead of raising doubts of its moral rectitude, could not fail to attract attention; could not fail to *charm*, by the dignified, primitive simplicity of its spirit; and powerfully tend towards that change in the general mind, which must precede the object of your solicitude, (in which I most heartily join with you) *the ultimate abolition and extermination of tithes!*—This conduct, while it would be extensively and usefully applauded by the wisest and best of men among other societies, would not fail to be productive of an edifying harmony and increase of numbers among yourselves; and under all circumstances, I most seriously submit to you, would be a conduct the most consonant to general rectitude, and to the obvious example of your divine Master.

SUNDRY PIECES,

RELATIVE TO

THE CASE AND TREATMENT

OF

HANNAH BARNARD.

IT appears, that in the year 1798, HANNAH BARNARD, an approved and duly-accredited Gospel Minister among the *Friends*, arrived in Europe, from the monthly meeting of Hudson, in the state of New-York, North-America, on a religious visit to the Society in Great-Britain and Ireland. That the certificate with which she left her home, contained a very full testimony of the unity of her Friends, and among other expressions, these, "her "ministry is sound and edifying, attended with a "comfortable evidence of her call thereto." This certificate she produced to full satisfaction, at the yearly meeting in London in 1799. And after travelling in England, Scotland, and Ireland about a year and ten months, apparently to the edification and comfort of those whom she visited, she appeared again at the yearly meeting in London in 1800. There she produced a most ample testimony of approbation from the yearly meeting of ministers and elders in Ireland, which she had attended but a few

weeks before. But at this last yearly meeting in London, she was suddenly arraigned of un-soundness in faith, and of heterodox principles, chiefly by an individual who had been the most active in furnishing her with the testimonial of approbation in Ireland, as aforesaid! This strange, this unprecedented occurrence seems to have been first, and suddenly, occasioned by some opinion of her improper sentiments respecting the wide extent of the Christian testimony against *war*. Those sentiments, however they may have been expressed, prior to this formal accusation, will appear fully in a paper which, in justice to both parties, I think it right to insert, that the ground of her *alleged* heterodoxy, which soon became extended to other points, may be fairly recorded. Another writer, under the title of "An "Appeal to the Society of Friends, on the primitive "simplicity of their Christian principles and church "discipline, and some recent proceedings in the "said society," published in 1801 and 1802, having fully, and with a masterly hand, detailed the whole proceedings against this eminent woman, I shall be the less particular as to those proceedings. But my first reflection must be, that it could not but be matter of astonishment to many *Friends*, that in a society bearing such a decided testimony against *war*, and its incompatibility with the nature of true religion and the attributes of the eternal GOD of love and peace, a Christian individual should be arraigned and denounced among them, for an opinion particularly strong on the side of their own testimony! The first formal reply to her accusers, relative to *war*, recorded as the words of Hannah Barnard, is remarkable, "that war is in itself, and ever was, a moral "evil, which man creates to himself by the misappli-"cation of his powers, or in other words, by the "abuse of his free agency." That she should be hereupon pronounced heterodox, and that she was

not one with the society, for professing such an opinion, is truly novel and curious! We may well presume that the same sentiment, in the same words, might have been spoken or written a thousand times by others (whom it was not made a point to accuse) without any suspicion of unsoundness and irreligion! The progressive procedure to *interrogate* her concerning her faith about other matters, which by industrious *report* had become articles of *suspicion*, may by some persons be considered as right; but if such an inquisitorial power, respecting points of private opinion, be once admitted and acted upon, as Christian,—what arbitrary discord and mischief may not be expected to follow, in any protestant society? Such discord and evil consequences will be *sure* to follow, in proportion to the openness and unguarded candour of the party interrogated: and that candour will frequently be found in proportion to the intrinsic value of the character; while the least charitable and most bigotted theorists, actuated by the common motives of such persons, will generally gain the popular ascendancy, under the profession of pleading for *orthodoxy*, whatever it be. Hence the causes of *persecution*, under a vast variety of shapes, in which church-history abounds, and frequently to the shame of the Christian profession. The Friend in question, it seems, was one of those, who was superior to the disguise of any sentiments which she had held from her youth up, and which she had not found impediments to her doing essential good to her fellow-mortals, in the great business of promoting the cause of righteousness and true Christian affection. She therefore gave to her examiners the following written statement of her belief:—

"Apprehending it my duty, when called upon, "to give an account of the substance of my faith as "a Christian, I believe it proper to commit the

"same to writing, and to submit it to the investiga-
"tion of any who may wish for information re-
"specting it.

"And in the first place, professing my firm be-
"lief in one GOD over all, who is above all, through
"all, and in all; and in his ordinary and extraor-
"dinary manifestations; I also acknowledge, that,
"though I believe in Adam's fall, I believe it con-
"sisted in a fall from innocence, and not from an-
"gelic perfection, as William Law and some others
"have imagined and asserted. But my settled be-
"lief has long been, that the Almighty saw meet,
"consistent with his power, wisdom, justice, and
"mercy, to create him a probationer; endowed
"with free-agency, and a measure of his own divine
"light, grace, or intelligence: and so I believe are
"all his offspring; with good and evil set before
"them, as it was before him.

"And when we become capable of the know-
"ledge, or discernment, of the different nature and
"effects of good and evil, and then voluntarily choose
"what the divine intelligencer in our own minds
"witnesses and warns us against, we fall, depart
"from, or forfeit innocence, and feel condemnation.
"From which we are again favoured with the gra-
"cious opportunity of being delivered, or restored,
"through repentance and turning from evil: unto
"which the divine principle within is ever ready and
"able to lead us, when we are willing to listen to
"it: agreeable to the concurrent testimony of GOD's
"witnesses through a long succession of ages, but
"in the *most full and clear manner in the dis-*
"*pensation of the Gospel*, as we have it recorded,
"and set forth, from and through its divine pro-
"mulgator, by precept and practice, who hath (as
"said the apostle) left us an example, that we should
"follow his steps; and has plainly told us, in the
"most unequivocal language, the consequence of

" disobedience on the one hand, or of due compli-
" ance on the other.

" This I believe to be the most perfect dispensa-
" tion ever ministered to man, in its kind; that is,
" an outward or secondary testimony of the will of
" God to us. And which, in substance, I have
" ever found to be coincident with the direct or im-
" mediate testimony and inward instructions of
" that life, which is the light of men; which justly
" claims the precedence of every outward means of
" instruction, being pure uncreated Truth, divine in
" its nature, universal in its diffusion, and saving in
" its effects; and is, I believe, the bountiful Crea-
" tor's free gift to his creatures.

" And being the pure leaven of that kingdom,
" which consists in righteousness, peace, and joy;
" it operates on, and produces in, the minds of those
" whose wills are brought into subjection to its go-
" vernment, a conformity to its own nature; which
" is order, harmony, and true solid peace; or, in
" other words, the pure heavenly image of righte-
" ousness and true holiness.

" Here is witnessed, in truth and reality, a put-
" ting on Christ, not by imputation, but actual
" operation; in which state he makes no scruple of
" acknowledging the spiritual consanguinity, or di-
" vine relationship; saying, *Whosoever shall do*
" *the will of my Father which is in heaven, the*
" *same is my brother, and sister, and mother*;
" notwithstanding, as the Father's most dignified
" Son and Messenger, the spirit or divine emana-
" tion was poured upon him without measure, and
" upon us by measure.

" This I acknowledge to be the substance of my
" faith, and the settled result of early and anxious
" enquiry, which I have long and firmly believed;
" yet hope ever to stand ready to exchange for bet-
" ter, if better there are: but while these remain to

"be my sentiments, my heart's desire and prayer is, "that I may ever be preserved cheerfully ready, "openly to confess before men; preferring the tes- "timony of a good conscience to the favour of "princes, and every other worldly consideration: "believing it my duty, nevertheless, to cherish and "extend charitable allowance towards all who may "apprehend they have seen further in any point "whatsoever; under the conviction that I am indeed "nothing without this Christian virtue; the essence "whereof I understand to be, love to GOD and man."

This paper having been audibly read by the clerk of the assembly to which it was delivered,—the account proceeds to state, that one rose, and, with great appearance of zeal, said, "it was well known he "was not uncharitable; yet he dared assert, that "any Unitarian might sign such a paper." But "some others said, they found no fault with it, as "far as it went, and so proceeded to question me "further respecting *original sin, the atonement,* "*miracles*, &c. I then told them, that I felt no li- "berty to commit myself any further, as I had sub- "mitted the general substance of my faith as a "Christian to them, with my particular sentiments "respecting war.

"For the latter of which, as I now stood declared "by them as not one of the society, in what I con- "sidered an unconstitutional manner, I had neither "encouragement nor freedom to descend further into "particular points at present; but apprehended my- "self under the disagreeable necessity of declaring "my intention of appealing from their decision, and "censure, to the body of Friends in this nation; to "which I felt myself bound in point of duty and "justice to myself, my connexions and friends at "home, to the society in Europe, and the cause of "truth and righteousness in general: adding, that "I was not afraid or ashamed to sue for peace,

"under all the discouragements with which I was "surrounded; and therefore intreated them to cast "the skirt of their patient charity over what they "considered my weakness, and still leave me at li-"berty to proceed on in the line of apprehended "duty; assuring them I felt so far from having ad-"mitted any hardness into my mind against any one "present, that, if they could only rub out their "black marks against me, I believed all would be "obliterated; and withal requested them carefully "to consider the consequences of persisting in their "present line of procedure, for their own sakes as "well as mine and others."

Thus it appears that this very sensible, and, as generally acknowledged, pious and worthy woman, solemnly professed her faith, in the substance of the language of her forefathers, and of the common publick preaching of the people called Quakers. The substance of the exceptions against the doctrine of William Law and others, respecting the original nature and fall of Adam, (which perhaps need not have been introduced) seems to form nothing of heterodoxy among *Friends*: for though the general Christian doctrines of William Law be often read among them with approbation, his peculiar sentiments about the first design of the Creator, respecting Adam's *immortal duration*, and the *mode of propagating his species*, &c. have always been considered by our most serious Friends as visionary,—and the nature of the fall to be much as our friend Hannah Barnard has professed to believe.—The progressive nature of *restoration*, also, through receiving and profiting by the operative power of God, however described, is in substance, and essentially, what our Friends have always maintained.—They say indeed, in scripture language, "As in Adam all "die,—in Christ shall all be made alive." But they frequently explain their meaning thus: *By that*

power of God in Christ, or through or by means of Christ, inwardly sent, or revealed, must this effect be produced in all the children of men. And it is plain enough that Hannah Barnard, in the above statement of her faith, has delivered nothing incompatible with this doctrine. She has laid no stress, nor could she think of laying any, on the sufficiency of human nature, as such, independently of the Divine assistance, to accomplish the great work of redemption, and of meetness for the kingdom of heaven hereafter.—She lays the grand important stress on the *putting on of Christ, experimentally,* according to apostolic doctrine, as the nature and great work of the Christian religion. And what is this, but the radical efficient belief of the power of God, *through Christ,* by which all men are to be saved and accepted; what is this, but speaking the substance of the Scripture doctrine,—or that Scripture doctrine which our Friends have ever spoken, for the reformation and salvation of the world?

With regard to the imputation of *Unitarianism,* as made by the speaker aforesaid, it is very uncertain in what sense, if in any defined one, the party used the term *Unitarian:* for nothing is clearer to my mind than that it is become, in the mouths of many, a term of ambiguous meaning, without any clear, definitive idea at all. I shall therefore omit any further remark upon it in this place, than sincerely wishing, that *he,* and his Friends, may possess all that advantage and inward comfort, which are derivable from a reverent belief in this plain Scripture doctrine,—that there *is but one God,—one* Christ, the anointed Saviour,—*one* Holy Spirit, whose presence is from the Father of all, for the sensible instruction, admonition, and joy, of the universal church.

The subsequent *unanswered* interrogatories, mentioned by Hannah Barnard, were not suffered to die away; but her silence, as might be expected, was

considered as a cover for improper *mental reservations;* the scrutiny and impeachment, as the aforesaid author has fully detailed, went on. She was enjoined silence as a minister, and the rumour of her heterodoxy spread far and wide: All her former Gospel services, by which many had once believed themselves edified, seemed to be willingly buried under a cloud of prejudices. Opinions were imputed to her which she never held: calumny was encouraged among the superficial and ignorant: and those of her own sex who could neither fathom her understanding, nor approach to her excellencies, were in the common habit of avoiding her as deluded, as dangerous, and as fallen from almost every thing that was good! The *youth*, to whom her benevolence strongly attached her, were taught to refrain from her company! But, what was most unpleasant, in publick meetings which she frequented for silent worship, the galleries of London sounded with inuendos of judgment and reproach. The general themes of *love* and *good works* seemed for a while to have lost their importance; and the public trumpets of the minor prophets, male and female, were mostly sounded to a new tune, viz. to the doctrine of *implicit faith*; *of salvation through faith; faith in all the scriptures;* and *lamentations* over the spirit of *unbelief*; as though some strange *monster* of unbelief had beset the society, and was attempting to destroy the very ground of all security, present and eternal. Nor were there wanting persons of reputed religious eminence, (though the number might be few) who employed the *pen* to circulate a kind of sacred derision, imputing to her principles of *Deism*, and tendencies to the most dangerous *scepticism* and *infidelity!* Those few of her sincere friends who continued their hospitality and affection to her, till the time of her final appeal should arrive, were considered and classed as favourers of li-

bertinism and unworthiness; a stigma rested on them; and even their fellowship and company were avoided. This account may be considered hereafter as exaggerated, but there are at present sufficient witnesses of the truth of the statement: and I give it as a *warning* proof of the effects of narrowness and bigotry of mind, which are ever to be expected from similar occasions, unless those who succeed to activity in the present and future generations, be more careful to guard against the spirit of prejudice, and its consequent errors.

Situated as I was with respect to the zealous, disciplinarian party in the society, and at so great a distance from London, I was not unacquainted with the current of proceedings;—and under a strong influence for the greater harmony and wisdom of the society, I sent forth in manuscript, for circulation among the Friends in London, the following paper, entitled—

CONSIDERATIONS *on the Matters in Difference between the Friends in* LONDON, *and* HANNAH BARNARD.

RESPECTING the matters in difference between our Friend Hannah Barnard and the Friends in London; having given them a serious place in my mind, strong have been my desires that reasons may be found for a *reconciliation*. When I consider the personal qualifications of the Friend in question, her zeal, strongly evidenced and not doubted, to promote the great work of moral improvement;—her reverence of the Supreme Being, as a God of love, purity, and peace,—the merciful Father, and Friend of the rational universe:—When I consider the certificates of regard, and of unity with her publick labours, which she has produced from solemn assemblies in her native land;

together with the difficulties of long journies, which she has been enabled to surmount, in the prosecution of her religious concern:—I feel much on her account on the one hand,—while I am not inattentive, on the other, to the regret which I am persuaded many of her opponents in London must have felt, that they should have found any cause of publick dissent from her principles, real or supposed.—The dilemma is painful to me—and I earnestly wish to state and explain principles of re-union and restoration. This, I think, is practicable; but it must be done on the foundation of great original truths, the admitted fallibility of human prejudice—and the impropriety of laying important stress on doctrines, which may not have been derived from real revelation, and the unchangeable attributes of the Supreme Being. In the theology of all ages and nations, wherein the idea of allegiance to a Supreme Creator, and a superintending power, have been promulgated, from the savages of the wilderness to the most refined associations, clouds of appendages, errors, superfluity, and superstition, often the effect of human craft and device, have been found. And we know too well that much of this deformity has been created and spread among those called *Christian churches*, wherein it should least of all prevail; and *our* religious society has been remarkable for deploring it! Is it not, then, of great importance that *we* refrain, as far as possible, from incumbering *our* system of faith and worship with unnecessary articles and restrictions, about which the most pious minds may never be uniformly agreed; and from setting up unnecessary *tests* of society orthodoxy and communion?

It does not appear that our antient Friends composed and set forth any original creed or profession, as to the *quantum* of their belief in the literal acceptation or import of the sacred Scriptures, either as

the *word of God*—or superior to the divine light, or evidence of God in the heart. Nor does it seem probable that they concerned themselves so much about uniformity of faith respecting all the historical facts recorded in the Bible, as the proper enforcement of piety and virtue. They chiefly preached the necessity of a practical reverent attention to what they variously, but impressively, described as the *manifesting*, *quickening*, *cleansing*, *sanctifying*, *redeeming* Spirit of God, through Christ, *inwardly revealed*: This they considered as the more sure word of faith, and of prophecy; and which George Fox remarkably maintained to be the seed of the heavenly life,—the power of God,—and as such, "the crown of all men's and women's meetings." This principle, received and obeyed, our first Friends deemed sufficient to turn men from the bondage of sin, and "from the power of Satan to the glorious "liberty of the sons of God;" which was in their estimation the great work of religion. At the same time they did not contemn, but highly esteemed, the *letter* of the scriptures, so far forth as it was a testimony of truth, and evidenced by the divine light and life given to them, and to men, generally, to profit withal. They entered not into abstruse enquiries, as to what Adam precisely was before he fell; or what he would have been, as to the immortality of his whole nature, or otherwise, had he not fallen by transgression. Such topics, so far as we can judge from the tenor of their writings, they considered as speculations about which *others* had vainly amused themselves and the world at large; but which *they*, when they became an united body, by the repression of such curiosity, and by their judicious silence, seem to have treated as a non-essential kind of theological faith.

They were too wise to state that they believed the Scriptures, collectively, to be either *the word of God*,

or *uniformly* to contain it. To such as rested so far in the letter, their testimony was, "the letter "killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." A large proportion of their sufferings, by prisons, beatings, and various abuses, arose from their asserting the superior evidences of the light and power of God in the soul—and the scriptures to be only *secondary*, not the certain, or superior rule, and touch-stone:—and this in substance was afterwards laid down as a notable principle in Robert Barclay's "Apology for "the true Christian divinity." That they enforced the doctrines of "righteousness, temperance, and "judgment to come," by preaching many solemn and apposite passages from the Old as well as from the New Testament, which "Holy men of God "had spoken, as they were moved by the Holy "Ghost," is not to be doubted—we have abundant proof remaining of such practice. But *they* seem to have largely relied on the solemn substance of that doctrine of the prophet, "He hath shewed thee, O "man, what is good; and what doth the Lord re-"quire of thee, but to do justly, love mercy, and "walk humbly with thy God?" Again, as referred to by Jesus Christ himself, under the idea of the greatest commandments of the law: "Thou shalt "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with "all thy soul, and with all thy mind: And thou "shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two "commandments hang all the law and the prophets." A simple, beautiful, dignified, and dignifying summary this, of whatever had been or could be obligatory, as the pure undefiled religion of man! A thousand and a thousand statements may have been made, (as they certainly have been) through a succession of ages, by innumerable efforts of the human mind, and that sometimes under supposed Divine influences; and there may have existed tens of thousands of sentiments, and varieties, degrees, and shades

of belief; about orthodox faith, and salvation; about rites and ceremonies and supposed ordinances; and about things which must perish with the using—the creatures frequently of human imagination:—But the marrow and soul of true religion is summed up [as in several other similar passages] in the memorable words above quoted. If *creeds* were wanting, they might furnish a creed for the universe—and for all time. The mind of an accountable being which dwells under the dominion, and acts from the influence, of such motives, is within the covenant of eternal life,—dwelling as on the holy mountain of God, where there is no violence, hurting or destroying. In the fulfilment of the spirit of such a definition and summary of moral excellence, it undoubtedly was, that the great Minister of everlasting righteousness placed his own office, "I come not "to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil." In the doctrine of the supreme love of GOD, the gracious Creator, and merciful Father of all men, glorious in his own immutable nature, *obedience* to his revealed law in the heart, whereby he shews unto man what is good, is evermore to be understood. But *obedience* is no farther such, than as it results from an undoubted perception and belief of the divine *requisitions*.—This belief, under the necessary imperfection of humanity, may not always be *infallibly* right, as referable to the perfect standard of truth,—for infallible certainty is only in the essential perfection of GOD himself. There is not to be expected a moral impossibility of all error, in finite apprehension. Proofs of this may be a part of the means appointed by infinite wisdom, for preserving the humility and happiness of created intelligent beings. Sacred story abounds with instances of misapprehension among men, who, in the main, appear to have been pious, and the sincere worshippers of the Almighty. Thus even *Abraham*, [that emi-

nent patriarch] may have believed that the will of GOD required him to sacrifice his only son, and that in a way which violated one of the strongest laws of nature, and all the most amiable feelings which adorn and dignify the head of a family, in a state of society. The effort of *obedience*, supposing it to be literally true, was one of the most horrid in itself, which the human mind can conceive of, even in the most awful enthusiasm of a maniack. The picture, *considered as such*, equals in horror the reprobated rites of those miserable pagan wretches, who afterwards made their children pass through the fire to *Moloch!*—who, then, shall say, and require others to believe, that Abraham, though possibly believing in a divine requisition, was actually required (and expected) by the GOD of truth and justice, thus to exemplify his love and obedience?—That a GOD of infinite love should interpose, and stay the hand of a poor mortal man, in such a desperate situation, may be well expected and believed. Such an interposition was strictly in character with infinite paternal Goodness! But that perfect Goodness and Consistency should really have *commanded* such a tragedy, [leaving the human mind in its ordinary state of feeling] as the test of love and piety towards himself, who was intimately acquainted with every possible previous disposition, is so far from being clear, that the whole soul of piety may shrink from it with pain and terror: and it may surely so shrink, without offence to the Author of our best and most lively feelings of mercy and compassion, the object of all our supreme reverence and adoration! *Lastly*; who then shall say, that a literal *belief* of such a divine *command* to Abraham is *now* necessary [as an article] in the qualifications of a *Gospel minister?* Who shall presume to question, and set at naught, the genuine nature of that Gospel love, which rises, flows, and actuates, independently of such a record?

AGAIN, it is not to be denied, that the Old Testament abounds with accounts of *contention*, *violence*, and *slaughter*, most painful to the feelings of the truly religious mind,—that mind which has studied in the *school of Christ*, which has learned to breathe in the element of love,—the pure, unpolluted element of GOD's eternal nature—for "GOD is love!"—It cannot be denied, that many of those accounts contain positive statements of GOD's judgements on different nations and descriptions of people, by means of the *sword* as well as of *famine* and *pestilence*. Several instances occur, in which He, the fountain of infinite benevolence and mercy, is represented as commanding the most sanguinary deeds of war and devastation, the destruction of innocent children, babes and sucklings—not to mention harmless cattle,—as the victims of his wrath and sore displeasure. And even men, represented as good and pious in his sight, are *made* the instruments of his vengeance on others, considered as his enemies, and in whose punishment unconscious, and therefore *unaccountable*, innocents are considered as divinely involved.—The picture which these accounts furnish out for our contemplation, according to the *letter* of history, is to the last degree miserable and full of horror.—Imperfect and inadequate to infinite comprehension as we are, we cannot say that the infinite Being, whom we adore, works not by ways which we cannot comprehend; we must acknowledge with all humility, that his ways are not our ways, and that he is infinitely exalted in his counsels above us: But we are called to a contemplation of his supreme nature and moral government, by the *use* of our rational faculties, if at all—not by foregoing their *use*, and confounding distinctions—not by disregarding the necessary consistency with himself [often proclaimed for our meditation] of a Being, whose attributes of power, wisdom, and goodness are eternal!

The language of divine expostulation to Israel surely goes on the ground of *rational* accountability in man, as to his estimation of the divine character; and it is a language adapted to all generations. "Hear "now, O House of Israel, is not my way equal? "are not your ways unequal?" All the confusion and variation from uniform peace and moral order in the world is of man, as a transgressing rebellious agent. The uniform will of GOD concerning every individual of the human race is his utmost happiness in human life, and moral improvement; with which doctrine (deducible from the tenor of scripture, and the best reason) a *command* for indiscriminate slaughter and sanguinary vengeance is completely incompatible.* Whoever would adore *him* as a perfectly good and glorious Being, must adore him as a Being who stands utterly opposed to all violence among moral agents, whom he has created for the superior practice of universal good-will, forgiveness of injuries, and to example each other, as individuals and as societies, in whatever the most nearly resembles, in our conception, his own infinite love. At least we are uninformed of any more consistent way of contemplating our adorable Creator, by which to stand approved in his sight. Or, if by such endeavours to understand and adore him, we could *sin*, we may reverently trust that such an error must be

*This must be allowed to be true, in the *rational* estimation of most serious people, in whom the adorable immutability of the GOD of Love is a fixed and joyful principle.—Any incomprehensible exceptions to such a belief may become points of individual faith, or admission; but about which it must be most wise and consistent for beings, such as we are, not to censure and criminate one another. It would be more happy for us to cherish the good, and evidently pious, affections and services of each other; and more especially where the evidence of such a bent of the mind, in publick characters, is clear, strong, and indubitable.

among the most pardonable in his sight. But sin is *otherwise* generated, and of an *opposite* nature.

If it be urged, "What, then, are we to believe, "respecting those accounts of a *positive command* "from the Deity, as to such various slaughter and "violence among men? In what sense, if any, are "we to understand such positive statements of the "divine vengeance? are we at liberty to set them at "nought as fables; as inventions or impositions of "mistaken or ungodly men?" To such questions let it be replied again and again, and let it never be forgotten, that there is no principle more strongly urged in the scriptures than this, that *the God of love is immutable:* In his essential nature, *he changeth not:* with him "there is no variableness "at all, or shadow of turning." From everlasting to everlasting, he is the same in all his attributes. His attributes have one uniform nature in themselves, and in their tendency to impress aright the minds of moral agents. His will and his consistency are never at variance. Rather than allow, for a moment, the contrary of these propositions, and of course its consequences, we may well adopt the language recorded concerning the Most High,—"Let God be true, "and every man a liar. It is impossible for God "to lie;" or to suffer the least diminution of his eternal sameness, or consistency with himself. It is, on the contrary, possible, that *all men* may err: Some deviations from absolute truth, especially respecting the inscrutible economy of the infinite Being, may take place in *all men*, who undertake to judge on the *positive* side of supernatural operation in the government of the universe: Such errors have undoubtedly taken place in all ages; and abundantly so among men of warm imaginations, who at the same time may have been in the main persons of religious zeal and confidence. The character has been of great antiquity, and is still prevalent in various

shapes. "I bear them record (said an observer of "this character) they have a zeal for GOD, but not "according to knowledge."* Some degrees of erroneous conception have taken place in the best as well as the worst of men; and will doubtless continue to appear, in the best who ever *shall* exist, in a state of imperfection. The first, the least imperfect, of the reporters of events, of whatever kind, must have been a creature at an awful distance from the perfection of GOD himself; and his testimony, however positive against the uniformity of the divine goodness and compassion, must be uncertain in proportion. The supreme, unchangeable, all-consistent GOD *cannot* so far act, or will, inconsistently with his nature and his law of love and peace towards all men, as to *command* them to destroy and treat with savage ferocity one another. It is allowed by all orthodox believers, that there is an important distinction between the *commanding*, and the *permissive* dispensations of GOD, towards men. He may *permit* them to abuse their moral agency, by going the barbarous length of devising and executing sanguinary deeds. He may *permit* men, who are successful in such a dreadful abuse of their powers,

* Who is there among *Friends*, who has been long a close and impartial observer of their publick characters, but must have observed frequent professions of *inspiration*, or being *influenced in the name of the Lord* to make particular *declarations*, *&c.* which have passed perhaps without any particular question or censure; but which it must have been common for sensible hearers to consider as the fruit of habitual *enthusiasm*, or *presumptuous imagination?* I mention not this with a desire to cast a reflection on the Society; or to *degrade* the scriptures by the comparison. But I state a question as founded on *fact*, the verity of which deny it who can: And as to its comparative weight, with reference to some more antient protestations in the sacred name of the holy, immutable, infinitely-exalted, and unsearchable GOD, let the serious reader draw his own conclusions!

to ascribe to him an active interposition in their favour. He may *permit*, that their pride and self-love should arrogate to themselves his sacred sanction of their murderous violence, in any terms of presumption! And that man is prone to do this, the uniform records and examples of all ages and nations, whether called civilized or barbarous, prove beyond a doubt. Whoever has attentively read general history, stiled *sacred* or *prophane*, has seen full evidence of all this, respecting men of various character, who are gone to their account with manifold imperfections and deeds of desolation on their heads! Nor want we examples of such impious arrogance, in our own times, and existing before our eyes, of such proud and diabolical devisers of wickedness. Men, who, in the foul spirit of false imputation, malignity and ambition, seem to disregard the blood of thousands or millions of poor ignorant fellow beings, whom they delude, train, and inflame to their purposes; and whom they send forth to slaughter, without any knowledge of the merits or demerits of the cause they engage in. The *national divinity* of the time being is called in to make it the work of Almighty God. The slavish attendants at the altar are called in to aid by the *mockery* of their prayers, thanksgivings, and consecrations, the success of an infamous work—a work now, as ever, abhorrent from the immutable *pleasure* of our Heavenly Father! Each contending party by turns lays claims to the divine benediction, and professes to consider the battle and the victory as those of the Lord of Hosts! The most debauched and prophane commanders, also, affect to dignify their characters, by ascribing their successes to the *special favour* of "Almighty God." These things are written down in books; but they are not the more sacred to posterity: they are, and will remain, of the indelible nature of their own origin, a mournful mixture of fact and misre-

presentation; and proceeding from that power of darkness who is the father of lies, the author of all discord and abominations of the earth! If we trace a similarity of complexion between such modern accounts, and others of Jewish and heathen antiquity, it will not thence follow, that *every* character concerned was rather criminal by intention, than under an unhappy *delusion;* but we may far more consistently suppose such a *delusion*, than attribute to the pure and perfect Source of love the *original contrivance* and *positive command* for such general butcheries of the human race; of beings created by his fiat, for the high purposes of moral instruction, of grace, and of glory! The positive *judicial* law of life and death [respecting the atrocities of individuals in society] approves itself far more to the rational understanding. "Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." But this *judicial* law most strongly *implies* and *involves* an utter prohibition of wanton *indiscriminate* slaughter among those to whom the law was given: and the spirit of it may well be considered as binding on all who profess to call upon the name of the Most High! However improbable it may be, judging from the various inconsistent opinions and records of past ages, that all men should become agreed in their faith, and construction of such historical records, it is at least worthily conceivable, that for religious purposes all men may sufficiently agree, and be satisfied in agreeing, on the great abstract principles, that GOD is truth, and that GOD is love; and hence find a safe, substantial, and peaceable ground of union, for worshipping and adoring Him, as "the center of all perfection, and the source of all good." This should seem to be a foundation broad enough for a full and permanent bond of union, fellowship, and delight,

and most surely of acceptance with "the GOD of "the spirits of all flesh."*

THE next topics on which we may consider the necessity or non-necessity of a perfect agreement of opinions, may be those of the proper *unity of God* —and the notion of a *satisfaction* for sins by a *vicarious* atonement. These again are matters which did not seem to be main concerns with George Fox, and our first Friends, to call for definitive understanding and strict theological agreement about: Still less as parts of a publick creed by which to be distinguished or approved by the world of professing Christians. Deeply concerned for the attainment of vital religion in themselves, and affected for the reformation of formal professors, and people sunk in iniquity and forgetfulness of God, they preached the grand essential doctrines of moral purity, *repentance and amendment of life.* Struck and animated by the sublime precepts and doctrines of Jesus, the Sent of the Father, and the moral Saviour of men,—they panted after an imitation of his perfections, and the experience of a life redeemed from the love of this world, and spiritually "hid with Christ in GOD." —They found by lively experience, that there was no peace to the wicked, no rest for an immortal soul, but in a course of watchful righteous living, and a constant obedience to the law of GOD—"the "law of the spirit of life, in [through or by means of]

* It could not be unforeseen by the writer,—that the brevity of this description of the *main foundation* of social reverence would be excepted against by some persons, in the present state of the professedly religious world, which abounds in attachment to small artificial distinctions about modes and complexions of faith and worship. But the grand articles of belief, as to the unchangeable TRUTH and LOVE of the universal Father, considered in opposition to the innumerable *falsehoods* and *hatreds* of even professed Christians, should lose none of their vast importance in the lamentable confusion, even to the end of time.

"Christ Jesus,"—the divine Teacher of the Gentiles;—who, though once *outwardly* crucified, dead, and buried,* was still, in his divine character, the messenger of light, life, and salvation, inwardly revealed: Him declared they unto the people, as the true medium of revelation, from the universal Father—the true shepherd and bishop of souls: Him they mystically received as the greatest revealed brightness of the glory of the Father,—and, therefore, by the highest of all [spiritual] figures, "Immanuel, or "God with us." In this experimental exalted sense of a practical Saviour, they believed, and grew strong in faith,—that lively, operative faith, which worketh by love to the purifying of the "conscience from all dead works, enabling men to serve "the living God in newness of life." Feeling the blessed effects of such a course of redemption, and believing there was no other way whereby men could be saved from present sin and from wrath to come, they laboured after the practice of the primitive apostles, and of Christ himself, while on earth, to warn, persuade, and to *save* men.—As instruments in God's own glorious work of moral reformation, for the purpose of redemption from all iniquity, and of a consequent acceptance with God, they considered themselves as co-workers with Christ, their holy head,—and the holy anointed high priest of the spiritual Israel, under a Gospel dispensation which was to be everlasting.

They preached, indeed, without ceasing, the doctrine of acceptance with the Father, "through Je-

* This passage, though in the original manuscript-copy, perhaps somewhat differently expressed by transcribing, or otherwise, must have been clearly *intended* by the writer in the sense now expressed; and could not have been intended in any other—it being an allusion to an historical matter of fact, about which there was no question, in controversy, or in his mind.

"sus Christ his Son, who died for all men; the just "for the unjust—that he might bring them to God" —having done the utmost that divine love, perfect meekness, patient sufferings, and death itself, could do, to draw them after him, and if possible *ransom* them from the power of iniquity!—In addition to their constant acknowledgement of him, as having appeared among men, clothed with mortality, our antient Friends stated his sufferings and death on the cross, as parts of the great work of his divine office, as Saviour of all them who believe unto righteousness. They preached the doctrine of his typical resurrection, and ascension to his Father's kingdom, and more immediate presence; and enforced the necessity of a moral resurrection, among his disciples, from the death and grave of sin to a life of righteousness and holiness,—to which his second coming without sin unto salvation was the all-sufficient, if accepted, means of raising them; the only means appointed by his Father, and their Father: for his life, and light, and power, were from the eternal will of the Father, and therefore standing in an indissoluble *union* and dominion with him. His testimony of himself and his Father, and the Father's recorded testimony of the Son, were accordingly in *union*,—one and the same in their glorious import. The Son being "the first-born of every creature," —exalted to be a prince and a Saviour,—above all principalities and powers, and to whom should the spiritual gathering of all people be; none could know and come unto the Father but by him, who was the way, the truth, and the life,—altogether divine and everlasting. This, in substance, was the scriptural doctrine of our first Friends respecting Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and of salvation by him. But their works may be read in vain, for any positive account,—certainly for any uniform account, of a *superior* divinity of Christ, as holding a

co-eternity, co-equality, or co-essentiality with the Father,—and yet as in person *separate* and *distinct*, but still precisely and uniformly *the same* being as the Father,—which is the unscriptural and strange jargon of monkish priests and confounders of divinity!—Such an imaginary Being must have been to our plain and unsophisticating forefathers not only incomprehensible, (as in nature it ever will be) but, in their opinion, altogether impossible.—They boasted not of the merit of a fanciful, presumptuous, and ridiculous faith, respecting the mode of the divine existence, of "the high and lofty One, who inhabits eternity,"—"whom no man hath seen or can see."—As teachers of *practical* divinity, they taught no such incomprehensible doctrine, either of the Godhead of the *Son*, or of the *Holy Ghost*,—the Comforter which was to come. Thus our ancestors kept clear, as a society, of factitious mysteries, the devices and fictions of mere mortal men, which minister neither knowledge, nor grace, nor godly edifying; but which, on the contrary, wherever they are received, or attended to as important, must be the causes of idle amusement at best,—but frequently of revolt and contention. Thus *they* seem to have lived in the simple reverence, and taught the faith, of the proper supremacy and unbroken unity of *one God*,—the adorable Creator of universal nature,—"the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,"—as of all the families of the earth—sovereign, indivisible, and immutable in himself! This testimony, in the "Sandy Foundation shaken," of William Penn, (unshaken by any thing he afterwards wrote) must remain a noble monument of truth and consistency owned and adopted by our ancestors.

Respecting a *special satisfaction* for sin, by any *vicarious atonement* of Jesus Christ, either as a meritorious suffering *Son*, accepted by the Father

for the appeasing of his own otherwise immoveable wrath; or, taken as a part of the *supreme Godhead*, becoming a suffering *self*, for the *appeasing of himself*, and for the removal of *his own* displeasure against all generations, past, present, and unborn; let also "the Sandy Foundation shaken" speak for our antient Friends, and the eternal principles of truth! —Let it speak the proper language of reprehension, of such things as are neither to be understood in the letter, nor to be felt or believed in the spirit!

THE subject of *miracles* related in the Scriptures may next come under our consideration. They have, as is well known, engaged the discussion of many writers, as well those of a sceptical cast as of professed believers, among whom have been men of great learning and of undoubted piety. It is by no means the intention of the writer of these pages, to extenuate the hardihood and frequent impiety of sceptical writers against miracles, especially those recorded of Jesus Christ or the apostles; writers who are sometimes found neither to have believed in a literal or even an allegorical sense, any statement at all of supernatural facts. The proper idea of a miracle being that of an event brought about in a way inconsistent with the received laws of nature, or by the immediate operation of an invisible power, must be considered as a special work of Omnipotence, rarely seen, or *rationally* to be supposed.—On the undoubted principle of existing *infinite power*, such a work is equally possible and easy with any common operation, in the way of apparent cause and effect; but they must of necessity make far *different impressions* on the mind of an observer, however pre-disposed by religion to admit the external evidence of supernatural appearance. That such an appearance has a natural tendency to excite *wonder*, which often, if not generally, implies some degree of *doubt* in the human mind, will be allowed. And

before the most sober and well-disposed mind can fully assent to the truth of a fact so indicated, it is not unnatural that a considerable degree of such *doubt* should exist. This propensity or weakness, if such it be, was remarkably exemplified in one of the apostles at the appearance of Jesus himself, whom he supposed, from all previous circumstances, to be lying buried in the sepulchre. The human mind, previous to its assent to the fact of a miracle, may be supposed to move *uncontrolably* from the object itself into reflection on the antecedent circumstances, and the nature and tendency of such an effect of supernatural power: If not overwhelmingly struck with the *reality* of the operation of such a power, it is not unnatural that the mind should also turn, as it were, to the contemplation of its own *frailty*, and the possibility that it may have suffered an illusion: for most human beings have been often conscious of mistakes of some kind, in the first supposed perceptions of an object, however plain, under *unusual* appearances. If such a degree of *caution, fear of deception,* and *final want of full conviction,* be not only natural, but unavoidable, in *some* minds, respecting things of their own supposed perception; it may not be necessarily wonderful, that, respecting some particular matters of antient detail which rest on the credibility of *others,* similar *doubt* should be felt. And it is at least presumeable that such feelings may be attendant on some honest minds,—sincerely believing not only the existence of one supreme adorable Being, the object of all worship, but in the fulness of his miraculous power:—minds not only in the solemn practice of adoration, but strongly desirous of promoting it in others, with all the concomitant affections. No wise or prudent man will undertake to say, that all persons, by any power *in themselves,* may attain to an uniform belief, or to any given degree of belief, in any matter

of a miraculous nature, however stated. And while it is certainly true, that no miracle, however divinely real, can be in itself any *positive* proof of any *other* fact or principle of religion, which are matters *distinct* from such miracle, and must be either true or false in themselves; it must be a reflection present to every well-informed mind, that nothing has been more frequently practised than *pretended* miracles, many of them of the vilest imposture, the better to propagate erroneous and worse opinions. They have been common in the most ignorant nations; and the Roman calendar is full of such impudent impositions, which thousands have been long deluded to believe. Such impostures are not hereby imputed to the Scripture authorities; but they are lamentably chargeable on the general history of religious miracles! and their influence must be *felt.* Under such circumstances of human nature, it may be neither wise nor proper for any religious society to require, as an article of brotherly union, an uniform belief (if that could be definitively known) respecting supernatural facts, recorded even in sacred history: variations of such belief in different persons may ever be expected, without impeachment of their moral rectitude, or their reverence for vital religion. Such persons may therefore well be received as fellow-members of a Christian church: and in proportion as their life and demeanor correspond with the nature of practical religion and piety, they may be even rejoiced in as fellow-servants of God, and among the real friends of men.—These general remarks apply chiefly to private individuals, of a religious community; persons who take no publick part in the promulgation of religious doctrines: But as it is possible that even among *publick* characters, who believe themselves divinely influenced to minister of righteousness and holiness, and the obligations to honour and adore the Supreme Be-

ing; and who make full proof of the usefulness of their ministry to those important ends; a question may worthily arise, whether even among *them*, a positive uniformity of belief respecting *all* recorded Scripture miracles, or the religious importance of them, ought to be sought and expected? Or whether it is not wiser, that, respecting such matters, and all others which are distinct in their nature from practical principles of real virtue and holiness, no important ideas of society—soundness in faith, or the contrary, should be entertained? For by the fruits of a divine love, moral purity, and an earnest zeal for their promotion, the Gospel spirit is fairly demonstrated.

WITH respect to the faith and character of the ministering Friend in question:—If it be true, as we may fairly believe it is, that she not only *does not deny* the literal facts of the Scripture miracles, however her sentiments may have been represented; but seriously believes, as she has ever solemnly preached, *that immediate operative power of God*, which is not only equal to the production, but superior to the work, of all miracles that ever were;—believing and teaching that so august and glorious are the evidences of *his* goodness, truth, and holiness, and of his worthiness to receive all homage and thanksgiving, that even miracles could not augment their solemnity to the intelligent mind—could not be, to the sincerely-seeking and pious soul, any stronger evidence in favour of true religion, than what the Most High is graciously affording to man, in the marvellous course of his general providence, and particular inspiration:—If, as is true, she has been uniformly and fervently employed in enforcing such doctrines, by the precepts and sacred example of Jesus Christ and his inspired apostles; and that with a zeal and solicitude, prompted only for the "Glory of GOD in the highest, peace on

"earth, and good-will to men;"—and finally, if, as is true, her labours of love in the line of the Gospel have been evidenced and sealed on many minds, for instruction, edification, and comfort;—what modification of *other* faith shall be properly *prescribed* for her? What application of church-discipline shall be warrantably made *against* her, in the name and authority of the Minister of ministers, or in any name and authority whatever?

Feeling, as we all should do, a strong interest in the progress of that work of righteousness on earth, which is peace, and the effect whereof is quietness and assurance for ever, I consider it as the serious concern of all, that no unnecessary impediment be offered or promoted, to such a work. The sum of iniquity and moral evil is at all times deplorably great,—the imperfection of all churches conspicuous: and unhappy indeed is that system or prejudice, which obstructs the stream of religious instruction, admonition, and encouragement in virtue. Unhappy indeed is that prejudice, which would disregard the main qualifications for the publick ministry—a devout and expanded mind, glowing with the constraining love of God, and the warmest love of the brethren!—A mind furnished, also, with its testimony against the sins and abominations of the earth, from the real vision of their manifold deformities, by having been brought to the hole in the wall, where the prophet sat!—It not only remains to be an important Christian rule, founded on the highest authority, that "whosoever is not against us, is "on our part;" but that, as formerly it was true, so now, and is of great importance to be considered; "God gave some, apostles; and some, "prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pas-"tors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, "for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of "the body [or church] of Christ." It behoves,

then, all men who would regard the order and authority of Divine Providence, and the great work of reformation in the earth, that they be solemnly on their guard against obstructing or lightly esteeming, any such instruments of good, in the line of their duty;—but rather to receive them, in the love and charity of the Gospel, [which rejects *doubtful disputations*] and endeavour to strengthen their hands for their work's sake.

The Writer of these remarks, actuated by love to the London Friends, and to the general cause of truth, is not desirous of imputing intemperate blame to any; but is fully persuaded, that while infallibility is wanting, some frail and too hasty judgment may take place, where particular tenets and articles of faith are urged into question: And he cannot refrain from thinking, that Hannah Barnard's suffering case is a proof of it. He therefore uses the Christian liberty of brotherly admonition on the present occasion. If the Friend, whose present situation he deeply regrets, has, as he cannot but believe, been hastily and harshly obstructed, and bound to silence,—may the voice of justice, and of Gospel propriety, be heard and attended to in the meekness of wisdom! May the further proof of her ministry be cordially cherished in that love which becometh brethren,—brethren who delight in the office of the "repairer of breaches, and the restorer of paths to "dwell in." Her spirit having been deeply baptized in suffering, though under the covering of exemplary patience, will receive new refreshment and ability for publick service from the great Source of all deliverance: And having been seasoned with that salt of the covenant of life, which is the virtue of the Gospel ministry, she may yet be enabled to finish her labour of love, and return to her native land with joy and peace in her own bosom. This must be the strongly affectionate wish of every living

member of the church, as well as of one who wishes not to be otherwise known on this occasion, than by the signature of

First Month, 1801. AMICUS.

Copy of Paper in Circulation AGAINST *Hannah Barnard.*

ACCORDING to thy request, I shall attempt to give thee a short view of H. Barnard's doctrine, which I hope may induce reflecting minds to be very cautious in adopting it. I mean chiefly to confine myself to remarks on her assertion, position, opinion, call it which we may, "That GOD never commanded the Israelites to make war."—Now Moses asserts that he did, using frequently the term, "Thus saith the Lord." It is plain that she makes out Moses to be a false prophet; but Christ, on the other hand, always speaks of him as a true prophet: —which of them (if I may without irreverence couple them in one relative) knew best, let the reader judge. Here then we have our new teacher at variance with Christ in her outset. To contradict is not to believe; but no one will say, that believing Christ is not necessary to be a Christian. I would hope she is not herself aware of the short cut by which this position of her's leads to *Deïsm*. If she be, she had better leave off talking of preaching the Gospel "freed from modern corruptions" at least; for this attack on the veracity of Christ, through that of Moses, is I think modern.

Now having shewn, I hope pretty plainly, how a denial of the claims of Moses leads to a denial of Christ, I may just mention a Scripture passage where Christ himself makes a disbelief of Moses the reason why he was not believed—It is John v. 46, 47.

"For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed "me, for he wrote of me; but if ye believe not his "writings, how shall ye believe my words?"—We see then how a disbelief of Moses, and such is saying that he was mistaken, leads away from Christ. I could shew it does so on another ground from that just mentioned; but this may suffice.

It is far enough for it to lead us, if it lead, as I have shewn, to *Deism*. But only take along with Hannah's position her reason for it, and we may probably get a few steps farther than that.

She says it is because a Being perfect in goodness could not command a moral evil, and that such is war. I believe I am correct as to her sense, if not as to her words: So then she would have us deny that he ever did command war. Now let her tell us why this glorious Being, who is perfect not in goodness alone, but also in power, permits war or any other moral evil.—If she say, because he will not destroy free-agency, the question still pursues her, why doth he prefer free-agency, which is continually abused, to absolute good? We must be content at last with an "I cannot tell;" and this I think we had better take up with in the other case. As to *permission*, we see it, and cannot explain it, and yet we have no alternative but that of confessing our inability to discover the cause; or of denying his moral government of the world: and so we may get on, till we land in denying him wholly, in pure *Atheism*.

First Month, 1801.

REMARKS *on a Paper said to be in Circulation, relative to Hannah Barnard; and dated First Month,* 1801.

WHEN an anonymous writer sends forth cautions against dangerous principles or opinions, which he imputes to a publick and respectable character, some caution is also proper in readers respecting the purity of *his* motives: and such caution should be the greater, in proportion to the odium which he attempts to fix on that character. That an odium was intended in the paper aforesaid, is but too obvious.

From what Hannah Barnard has said and written of her opinions on war, and the spirit of warfare, as opposed to the principles of the Christian religion; it must appear to the candid and religious mind, that she is actuated by a serious and earnest disposition for the promotion of Christian love, and the divine affections of the Gospel.—Such a disposition was never more necessary than in these unhappy times:* and it should so far forth endear her to the lovers of peace, and recommend her to the charitable esteem of *all,*—even those who may heretofore have thought differently from her on *antient dispensations* of Divine Providence: About the original *will* and divine preference of the eternal GOD of peace, respecting universal love and harmony in the world, there can be no question among the reverent and the good.

That *Moses,* the lawgiver of the Israelites, was a distinguished and comparatively enlightened character, neither Hannah Barnard, nor any of her friends can profess to doubt. The laws which he promulgated, from whatever degree of Divine influence, were largely political, for a temporary purpose; and so far as their designation was religious, they were intended but as a "school-master," to lead to something better, to a more perfect dispen-

* Of the general war against the French Republick.

sation. But that Moses was more than *a man*, of a frail and fallible nature, the records concerning him do not warrant us to believe. His fallibility was exemplified in almost the first remarkable act of his life, i. e. his privately murdering and burying an Egyptian in the sand; in his passionate wrath with the people; and in breaking the tables of the law, &c. Neither was he permitted to share in this office of leading the people, or entering himself, into the *typical rest*,—the promised land. Under this view of the Jewish legislator, it cannot be necessary for professed Christians to attempt to fix a standard of orthodoxy about his personal character; or the divine importance, *to them*, of the dispensation in which he acted. Their faith, and great business in life and doctrine, are of a newer, more certain, and more spiritual nature: Nor is it a clear deduction from the quotation of Jesus, that, because he mentioned to the Jews the writings of Moses concerning a future dispensation of the peaceable Messiah, he considered Moses as a *spiritual* and *perfect* character:—Far less, that whatever he was said to have written, believed, and done, was to be literally considered as binding on the spiritual faith of Christians, and essential to their character as such. The writer in question says, that "to deny is not to believe." —But who has found Hannah Barnard *denying* either the Spirit, or the words of Christ's recorded testimony respecting Moses, or respecting any other subject? Is it not rather for her *strict belief* in the substance of the Christian dispensation of universal *favour* and *love*, as opposed to *war* and all *violence*, (however these may have been imputed to the positive *command* of an immutable God of love and peace) that the soundness of her faith has been called in question? Is it not because she reverences the great and glorious dispensation of "*grace* and *truth*, "which (in a renewed and emphatical manner)

came by Jesus Christ," as infinitely superior to all vindictive and adverse terrors of "the law given by "Moses," that inconsiderate persons have attempted to *unchristianize* her faith? Does *this* accusation imply any thing like "*Deism?*" Or is *this* her approaching within "a short cut" of *Deism?* —Who, beside such a writer as the one in question, ever found *Deism* allied to a sacred belief in the peaceable dispensation of *Jesus*, and of that "life "of God in the soul of man," which Hannah Barnard maintains? and which she maintains, too, in agreement with the first teachers of the Christian faith, under the name of Quakers? If such deductions and imputations can be countenanced by the judges in a church, who can be safe from detraction and from slander?

A few words more as to his unwarrantable insinuations about "*Atheism.*"—If a *commanding* and *permissive* conduct of the *Infinite Being*, with respect to *moral evil* in his government of the world, be *equally* incomprehensible by *finite* beings; it will not follow that one who may be able to believe the *latter*, but not the *former*, is ever the more an *Atheist*, or within a "few steps of Atheism," or getting on towards it!—All *Nature*, as well as all *Grace*, (abundantly shed abroad in the intelligent immortal mind) proclaim aloud the being of that God, whom Hannah Barnard, and all who think with her, see, feel, reverence, and adore! Such evidence they feel to be the light and glory of that "tabernacle of witness" which shall endure for ever; "the true tabernacle which God hath pitched, and "not man,"—consecrated to love and to peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost! And their prayer is, that not only they, but their misjudging brethren, and all the "kings and inhabitants of the earth, may "bring their glory and their honour into it."

Third Month, 1801.

The same disposition which dictated the foregoing pieces under the same signature, suggested the following Cautions.

THE case of Hannah Barnard has been so much the subject of conversation in the Society, especially among Friends in London, and so much apparent pains have been taken to prejudice the public mind of the society against her, that it seems to me proper to issue a few fresh strictures of a cautionary nature. She has been so far accused of unsoundness in religious principles, and of such a denial of reputed fundamental doctrines of holy Scripture, as to countenance *insinuations* of a general *scepticism* and *infidelity*. Those wide, unqualified *insinuations* have obtained but too much credit, among persons who have not had the means of understanding wherein her supposed defection consists; and of course the prejudice has spread far and wide, on very insufficient and erroneous grounds. One writer in particular seems to have had it much at heart, not only to propagate *his* construction of words which she is said to have used, on particular topics; but, to infer and cause others to believe, that she is an enemy to Christianity, nearly approaching to *Deism*; he has even insinuated an approximation to *Atheism!*—So disingenuous, so cruel a conduct, towards a person of her approved integrity and general piety, could not have been expected from one who professes the spirit, as well as the letter, of the Christian religion.—This unchristian and unwarrantable conduct is the more reprehensible, when it is considered in what situation she now stands. As an appellant against calumny to the solemn consideration and decision of her brethren at the Yearly Meeting, her cause was too sacred to have been treated in such a manner by any one, especially by a person tenacious of the soundest dis-

cipline of the society, however active and censorious in his own spirit.—That matters have been thus stated by him as facts, but which remain to be proved; and pre-judgment widely excited, without warrant; seems sufficiently evident. And unless he had proceeded, in violation of the order of the society, to *print* and circulate calumny against a suffering party, unheard in a final appeal, it is difficult to say what more disorderly and inflammatory steps could have been taken. Who this anonymous writer is, the author of these remarks does not know; and perhaps were he to allow himself the liberty of guessing, he might impute erroneously: he therefore represses every surmise of that sort—nor is he influenced by any opinion he has heard suggested. As a friend, however to consistency, he hopes that a person who has proved himself capable of acting in so disingenuous a manner as that writer has done, will not suffer himself to be appointed on a committee of judgment, to which every man should come with clean hands and an unprejudiced mind: And not only so, but, that having done too much already, he will scrupulously refrain from all endeavours to influence in opinions on which a final judgment may be founded. From the seriousness of conjectural reports, which have been propagated against the appellant, it must be desirable to every candid and religious mind, that the issue may be more favourable to her than some may have been led to expect, however prepared she may be to receive an acquittal without triumph, or a possible censure with equanimity and resignation. That the decision will be just and impartial, I will not allow myself to suspect; for it is a subject which on one hand may excite a strong desire to consult the future well-being of the society, in point of religious truth; but on the other, a correspondent tenderness and caution, respecting the right of private judgment; while it will be considered, that the ap-

pellant is certainly a *calumniated* individual—that individual, a *woman*—and that woman, a *stranger* from a *foreign land*. These considerations will be admitted as salutary by many, if not by the writer alluded to. I have had my share of evil-imputation from him; and such has been the boldness of his calumny against me, and others, who conscientiously think well of our accused friend Hannah Barnard, that I should be wanting to the cause of religious liberty, were I to pass by in silence a long manuscript of his, which has been circulated with much industry.—I may possibly, at a suitable period of this business, cause a *printed* reply to appear, (in the society *only*) thinking it most proper, for the sake of correctness and more general perusal, to adopt *that* mode of answering my opponent. But as it must necessarily be, that the name of Hannah Barnard, and the merits of her case, so far as I understand them, make some part of my object; I do not intend that such *printed rejoinder* shall appear prematurely in point of time. For I would be tender of any *apparent* disregard to the prudent rule of the society, prohibiting *printed* appeals previous to hearing—although it does not appear probable that, were I now to circulate my *answer*, any infringement of the rule in question could be *fairly* alleged. But though Hannah Barnard has no knowledge of any thing I may cause to be printed, or directly or indirectly any part or influence in the measure, I am desirous that no cause of a contrary suspicion may operate on the mind of any Friend on her account.

Fifth Month 4, 1801. AMICUS.

THE last of the foregoing papers concluded what I judged proper to be said by me on behalf of the accused party, previous to the sitting of the Yearly Meeting in the latter part of the same month. The various proceedings of *that* meeting, and also of subordinate ones, on the case, prior to the final decision, having been circumstantially detailed and commented on by the Author of AN APPEAL *to the Society of Friends*, since printed and published, in several numbers or parts; I think it sufficient to refer to that accurate performance for such *detail*. In that work will be seen more than sufficient to convince most candid readers, of much irregularity and hard measure in the whole of the treatment.—But, to proceed—my mind was impressed with a persuasion, that the *official* business of investigating and passing sentence in matters of *faith* is too often undertaken and concluded by persons little accustomed to search to the bottom of principles and difficulties,—persons who think meanly of such a sentiment as this,

> "I cannot boult this matter to the bran,
> "As abler Bradwardine or Austin can."

And knowing that such persons are not only too little attentive to real difficulties, but to the true tenor of scripture-authority,—I caused the following printed paper to be sent to numerous active individuals among the *Friends* in London, on the day previous to the notable *conclusion* on Hannah Barnard's case. My intention in so doing was, to shew that many points were necessary to be seriously adverted to, before a *judge* on controverted topics should make up his mind to promote *publick censure* in matters of faith; especially where moral rectitude, and good intention in a party arraigned of error, made no part of the main questions. And I think it not improper to insert the paper here, to the end that the points alluded to

may stand for consideration, in the same form, in this RECORD.—It may possibly tend to some useful purpose in future—at any rate it can do no hurt among persons who need the practice of *close examination.*

A serious Address to the Yearly Meeting of Friends in London, 1801.

WHEREAS, in consideration of divers recent cases, it has been thought by many Friends, that great disadvantages have arisen, and may be expected to arise, in the society under our name, on account of the want of something like *a plain standard,* or *society-agreement,* relative to *essential* articles of religious faith; and that general satisfaction and service might result from duly defining sundry points, to the end that all which is *essential* in belief, to the character of a sound member of the body, may be known:—The following important *Queries* are submitted to the consideration of the present Yearly Meeting, as a short series, by which the meeting may usefully proceed in defining the articles of such *essential* faith. And it is presumed, that though some comparative difficulties might be attendant on an undertaking to settle such points, by an individual, or an inferior body; yet, that in a solemn assembly, delegated and met, and collectively acting, in the name of the whole society, satisfactory clearness and soundness of exposition may be hoped for. Or, if not attainable, an explicit declaration may be profitably made, *That the society cannot undertake to set up a standard of faith in such matters, whereby to bind or regulate the minds of its members.*

The great duties of men in society appearing to arise out of the respective proper natures of, and re-

lationships between, the Sovereign *Creator* and the *created*, the following order has been adopted in propounding the queries:

1. What is *essential* to be believed respecting the nature of ALMIGHTY GOD, chiefly as to his *unity*, —or the contrary?—His eternal *power?—goodness?—wisdom?*—and as to his *immutability?*

2. What respecting the nature of JESUS CHRIST, —and his relationship to the Supreme Creator?—In what sense can he be most clearly understood, as the *mighty God?*—as the *everlasting Father?*—or, if at all clearly so, how then as the *Son* of GOD?—or, as a *man*, approved of GOD?—How as the *Author* of eternal salvation?—And what of his *atonement?—propitiation?—satisfaction?*

3. What respecting the doctrine of the HOLY SPIRIT, as a Being distinct from, or in connection with, any other being?

4. What respecting the *original* and *present* state of MAN:—Whether the account of the *fall*, as stated in Genesis, be to be received as *literal*, or *allegorical?*—And what of man's relationship to *God?*—and to *Christ?*—and to the *Holy Spirit?*

5. What respecting the nature and degree of INSPIRATION, for which man may be considered as fitted and designed?

6. What respecting man's proper belief, in the *inspiration* of the *whole* of those writings called the SCRIPTURES, of the Old and New Testaments—as they may have *originated*—have been *canonized*—and *now stand rendered?*

7. What respecting man's ACCOUNTABILITY, to the Author of his being *alone?*—And to his fellow-creatures, in a *religious connection?*—And of INFALLIBILITY, or the contrary, in any *church?*

8. What respecting any ordinary or extraordinary power (short of *infallible*) of any church over its

members,—in matters neither *defined* nor *definable*, —and therefore *uncertain?*

9. Why require of your members a refusal to pay *tithes*, demanded by *law*, for a *peaceable* purpose; and yet *voluntarily* pay the *income-tax*, professedly levied for *war* and *destruction?*

The foregoing queries are not given, as including *all* points, about which it may be useful for the society to state its agreement; but as they directly, or by consequence, extend to a very large proportion of important points of faith, they are offered as such.*

Signed on behalf of the Propounders,

THEOPHILUS.

---

* I am since told that they have been considered as *speculative*, *subtle*, *crafty*, and as tending to injure the *simplicity* of true religion; that *simplicity* especially, which should adorn the faith of *Friends*. It is difficult to understand what such phrases signify; but I think they are more properly the language of *indolence* grown into habits of *implicit dependence*, than of any thing worse:—And yet even *that* is bad enough! For it is the way to a disagreeable subserviency in the *many*, and the admission of a dictatorial authority in the *few*. And whoever is too indolent, or too timid, to endeavour according to the best of his abilities, to understand distinctions, and judge of mysteries for himself; must ever be unfit to sanction, even by his *silent* presence, the doubtful, but dogmatical decisions of *the few* arrogant movers in matters of Faith.

CONSIDERATIONS CONSIDERED.

THIRD MONTH, 1801.

The following Piece is one of those which I have before alluded to, as handed about in manuscript, immediately after its date, and purporting to be an answer to my " Considerations on the Matters in Difference, &c."—*but, as I think must be manifest, chiefly with a design to prejudice the active members of the society in London against a solitary stranger, whose final appeal was then approaching. This view of the subject I conceive myself warranted in taking, whatever may have been the Author's professions of a more plausible nature. I had read it in an early stage of its circulation; and the order of dates might have placed it* before *some of the foregoing pages; but I insert it here, that it may be followed immediately by the* Rejoinder, *intended as its proper answer.—That answer having been written, and first printed, amidst various interruptions of business, I afterwards judged not so full and particular as the numerous topics might be thought to require. On this account I have used the liberty of subjoining, for this publication, a few additional* Notes *on some parts of the text of my opponent.—For this liberty it would be in vain to make any apology, if the Notes themselves should not be judged fair and pertinent by candid readers. On the contrary, if they shall be found such as to obviate errors, an additional end will have been answered.*

W. M.

---

1. AMONG the various things which have been said and written, respecting Hannah Barnard, there is not any one which shews more clearly to my understanding the discordance between her and the society of Friends, than an anonymous manuscript, pretending to discover grounds for a " *re-*

"*union and restoration.*" It is dated the First Month, 1801, and entitled "Considerations on the "Matters in Difference between the Friends of Lon-"don and Hannah Barnard." The author professes to feel much for Hannah, in which he may be believed; also not to be inattentive to her opponents in London—this being negative, we may allow also; yet I can scarcely believe his attention to be that of sympathy. So here, in the outset, we are presented with an uneven balance, and a portrait of justice divested of her bandage.*

The dilemma however, he tells us, in which he finds himself, between Hannah and our Londoners, is painful. Once more I will believe him; not, nevertheless, because he is in doubt on which side the beam should preponderate, but because he fears for the common cause in which he is engaged with his friend; namely, the cause of *scepticism.*†

He earnestly wishes to state and explain principles of "reunion and restoration." These and the following are his own words only with change of person. 'This,' he thinks, 'is practicable; but it must 'be done on the foundation of great original truths, 'the admitted fallibility of human prejudice, and the 'impropriety of laying important stress on doctrines 'which may not have been derived from real reve-'lation, and the unchangeable attributes of the Su-'preme Being.'

Our writer, having stated thus much, goes on pretty roundly to establish all the points in which Hannah differs from Friends; and this is his plan, "for reunion and restoration." But I conceive his

* This rhetorical flourish, neither the subject, nor the simplicity of Friends should seem to require: and there is a considerable degree of *blindness* in the use of it.

† If this be a *religious* beginning, it is at least not a *civil* one. May it not be more properly called *symptomatic* of a kind of religious fever, attendant on a party writer?

sober readers will require somewhat of a clear definition of what are, and what are not, "great original truths," and what doctrines have, and what have not, "been derived from real revelation;" more especially as, *seeing the Scriptures form no part of the foundation which he lays,** we may well believe that he does not mean to allow their testimony, any further than it quadrates with his opinion. Now it appears increasingly clear to my understanding,† by this statement, that we are not so much engaged in a controversy, as between Christians, respecting various constructions of the doctrines which we in common hold to be divine; as in a controversy with those, of whom if it be not the secret (as it is not the avowed) intention to overthrow the Christian faith, such is the tendency of their proceedings. It also appears, by a refusal to suffer the matters in debate to be tried by the record of Scripture, considered as a true record,‡ a standard from which Quakers have never shrunk, that the writer is conscious on such grounds, he can never support Hannah's cause.

* Why will an advocate for orthodox truth so grossly misrepresent? From a man who either wilfully or negligently does so, what fairness can be expected on any point in queſtion?

† But strong prejudices, and a readiness to impute error in religion, have caused many a tolerable understanding to lose its *clearness*.

‡ This appears to be a very favourite *test* with our author; but chiefly calculated to fix odium on a refusal—or to lead into "doubtful disputation." For though the volume of Scripture, devoutly and discreetly used, be invaluable to the pious mind; yet who knows not, that the *warmest*, the *longest*, and most *unsatisfactory* controversies have been maintained about the true meaning of this *record of Scripture*, and even by those who have professed to take it as a *true record?*—This kind of test was *finally* proposed in the publick Yearly Meeting to Hannah Barnard, with more craft, than candour, wiſdom, or goodneſs. She ſaw it, and treated it as any other ſenſible and ingenuous perſon would have done. Any little credit which

2. After some general remarks, contrived in terms which must ensure assent, although they convey no precise idea,—the impropriety of "setting up *un-* "*necessary* tests of orthodoxy;" for instance, the writer proceeds to persuade us, that our antient Friends did not attempt to set forth their belief as to the various doctrines of Scripture, so much as to enforce attention to the heavenly life in the soul, and practical obedience. This is very true, and for this simple reason, that the people at that time had not arrived at such a pitch of sceptical confidence, as to call Scripture in question; but rather *doted* upon it with a reliance, which our Friends believed to be prejudicial;* but if our writer would have us think that they did not attend to doctrinals at all, his favourite "Sandy Foundation shaken, printed in "1668," and the despised "Innocency with her "open Face," the latter particularly, will serve to shew, that he would impose upon us an error. Barclay's Catechism and Confession of Faith was first printed in 1673; his Theses soon after; his Apology in 1676; Lat. and Eng. 1678; Crook's Truth's Principles, 1663; Nayler's Truth cleared from Scandal, 1653;† as it is to our purpose, I will

might possibly be gained among the less thinking by such a publick proposal, no wise man will envy.

* If we could conceive that this writer is perfectly sincere in all he professes to believe about the *whole* of Scripture, and its necessary connection with the faith and character of a Christian, we might be led to think that he also *dotes* rather largely, and that he is consequently not quite so sound in his mind as he should be.

† I am sufficiently prepared to think well of the judgment of that once enlightened, and finally happy man. But I see nothing in this quotation, fairly understood, which can serve our author's main purpose. Who doubts the general benefit to be derived from the Bible, as a volume of sublime instruction? Who doubts that those numerous parts which are adapted to that end, were given forth by or under the influence of the *Holy Ghost?* Every thing divinely good comes

cite this very early testimony of Nayler, then an approved friend, and long before his fall, respecting the Scriptures :—

"They are a true declaration of that word which was in them, that *gave* or *spake* them forth, and are of no private interpretation; but were given forth to be read and fulfilled in the saints, as they were given forth by the Holy Ghost, without adding or diminishing; and were not given forth for man to make

from the same divine Source.—As to *adding* or *diminishing*, I *wish* not to do either; but we need have no doubt, because the fact is proveable, that *additions*, and bold ones too, have been made since the Apostles' times; and but for *diminishings*, which have taken place in various ways, we should have had a book of far different canonical bulk from the present.—Let us come at once to a few plain questions. Does our author profess to believe, and want us to believe with him, that that very collection of ideas now conveyed by our common, or by any other translation of the books of scriptures *now* called *canonical*, is, in sense and number, precisely that aggregate, which was *originally* given forth by the Holy Ghost? And if so, does he of consequence mean to say, that all *additions*, by *interpolation*, since the prohibition in the Apostles' days, are of the Holy Ghost? and that all synods, counsels, committees, and pontifical authorities, which have been since employed in *diminishing*, by cutting off parts as *spurious* which had been received as *genuine*, were inspired by the Holy Ghost also?—If he will plainly declare, on behalf of himself and his friends as a body, that he does so believe, we must give him the title of *The Marvellous Believer*; reserving to ourselves the right of judging, how far he can be the sound and sane representative of a body of sober and and reasonable men. If, in the cooler exercise of a good understanding, he would rather refrain from such extensive professions, we must be left to think as we could of his manifold reproaches, and imputations of scepticism!—But, finally, leaving him and his zeal both out of the question, we must endeavour to use and profit by the Scriptures, as we can; regarding them according to their internal evidence of inspiration,—and as their various contents impress our minds in a sober and reverent attention: this brings us to the substance of James Nayler's sense on the subject, and of all our most sensible ancestors.

a trade upon, to get money by; but as they are, they are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of GOD may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." Nayler's Works, p. 21. Now Hannah Barnard sets aside or diminishes Scripture, as for a few examples: Exodus xvii. 8 to 16. Lev. xxi.* Numb. xxxi. 1, 2, and 25 to 31. Deut. xx. Joshua vi. Judges vi. vii. viii. chap. xi. 29, and in many other parts; and yet, strange! she and her apologist want to make us believe that she is one with our early friends.

Isaac Pennington, said, in 1675 (preface to Flesh and Blood of Christ, &c.) "I have had experience of that despised people for many years; and I have often heard them (even the ancient ones of them) own Christ inwardly and outwardly: Yea, I heard one of the ancients of them thus testify in a public meeting many years since—that if Christ had not come into the flesh, in the fulness of time, to bear our sins in his own body on the tree, and to offer himself up a sacrifice for mankind, all mankind had *utterly* perished!"—Whitehead's Divinity of Christ was printed in 1669; his Christian Quaker 1673. To which may be added, that soon after the establishment of the Yearly Meeting it adverted to doctrine in its Epistles.†

Now whence can arise this attempt to make us think our ancient Friends undervalued‡ the out-

* As this chapter of Leviticus seems to have struck our author as fully in point, both as to doctrine and delicacy, we may be the better pleased with him for not having given it at length!

† Yes, and we have no doubt but they adverted largely to *doctrines*, such especially as related to practical piety and *Christianity*, long *before* they printed Yearly Meeting Epistles.

‡ We do not say they *undervalued* it; but we say with Robert Barclay, in substance, that it is inferior to the evidence

ward testimony of Scripture? Because that is a principal thing in which Hannah dissents from us.

It is too glaring to be contradicted. We are, therefore, to be reconciled to it, by having it insinuated to us that they were alike gainsayers.

After raising about our ancient Friends the *mist** *which I have thus endeavoured to disperse*, the writer adverts, with truth, to their enforcing the practical part of religion, in their frequent use of the texts, "He hath shewed thee, O Man, what is "good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly "with thy GOD?" and "Thou shalt love the Lord "thy GOD with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, "and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy "neighbour as thyself." This latter text he calls a "simple, beautiful, dignified, and dignifying "summary of whatever had been, *or could be*, "obligatory, as the pure, undefiled religion of man." Christ's own, more simple eulogy is not adduced; although it may be conceived that he knew better how to appreciate the commandments than our positive declaimer. "On these two commandments "hang all the law and the prophets." But here would have been an opening for something more. An old-fashioned Christian might have said, that this was indeed addressed to a Jewish scribe, and that he, in receiving it, was "not far from the "kingdom;" but that to make him a Christian,

of the spirit of GOD in man; and having many uncertainties and imperfections. If that be in fact *the principal thing in which Hannah Barnard dissents from us*, i. e. from such modern Quakers as this writer, there was the less reason why she should have been reproached and calumniated as she really was, under the notion of her *scepticism* and departure from the settled faith of the body.

* We seek not to raise about them any *mist:* We give their *words*, and trust we deduce their import.

one thing more was lacking, namely, a belief in Christ, the mediator, redeemer, and Saviour.*

Now this is all excluded by the new character given by this writer, "*it is a summary of whatever had been, or could be obligatory.*" So first he dogmatizes,† and then builds argument on his own assertion.

I shall here quote the next sentence, which may serve as a specimen of the precision in expression, which may be expected from this writer! "A thousand and a thousand statements may have been made, (as they certainly have been) through a succession of ages, by innumerable efforts of the human mind, and that sometimes under supposed Divine influences; and there may have existed tens of thousands of sentiments, and various degrees and shades of belief, about faith and salvation, and rites and ceremonies, and supposed ordinances, and things which must perish with the using, the creatures frequently of human imagination; but the marrow and soul of true religion is summed up in the memorable words above quoted."

To omit much remark on the tautologous expression of a *belief* about *faith*, (which is much the same as a faith about belief) what shall we think of the clearness of the conception of that writer, who jumbles together salvation and things which must perish with the using—faith, and the creatures of human imagination?

If we believe the ideas of these things are more distinct in his mind, than he has chosen to exhibit

* We deny neither of *these* characters; but perhaps we are safest and soundest, in not allowing our author to define their respective senses for us: we prefer those of Jesus himself.

† If by *dogmatizing* is meant any thing different from plainly using the plain sense and tenor of scripture, I must except against the charge. *Dogmatizing*, surely, is not the weakest feature of our author's own character.

them on paper, we shall be led to suspect him of purposely involving his subject in darkness, that the sophistry of his argument may elude the observation of the simple. And shall we take such an one for our guide in matters of the highest concernment; and for him, relinquish Moses and the Prophets, the blessed Jesus and the Apostles? Far be it.

Such is in general, as far as I have observed, the conduct of sceptics. They lay claim to great piety, and (if I may so say) to violent veneration for the Supreme Being; they affect great candour and coolness; *zeal* does not *seem* to be one of their weapons; they appear to melt in benevolence and pity over the miseries of man; and will scarcely allow the Almighty to possess any other attribute *than love.*

The reason of man they exalt to the skies; for, having laid down as an axiom what they conceive the Deity ought to be, they will not allow that he can act, but according to their preconception. Nevertheless, when it suits their purpose, the fallibility of man is brought prominently to view; especially when an old Prophet is recorded to have said something which they disapproved; and more especially if it has been said in the name of the Lord.

3. This champion of Hannah accordingly having veiled her general heterodoxy in the dark, but not impenetrable, shade of his "Considerations," has now to bring under review the particular subjects which have engaged her attention; and he begins with Abraham, a personage, I allow, eminently fitted to be the aversion of infidels, as he is called the Father of the Faithful. But with all the preparation of his preceding pages, he seems afraid to trust Abraham with us yet. The story of Abraham is indeed hard to get over. Even Hannah herself seems to have dissembled about it; for she made her visitors of Devonshire-house almost believe she was orthodox in that.

But now, in her new Apologist, the veil is again removed; and as we can no longer be amused, he endeavours to prepare us for receiving, respecting her, his evidence of the *whole truth*.

After a prelude on the Divine attributes, we are told that "Obedience to the law revealed in the heart "is evermore to be understood; that true obedience "must result from undoubted perception and be-"lief of the divine requisition; yet this belief, under "the necessary imperfection of humanity, may not "always be infallibly right." The proof of this fallibility he thinks may be a part of the means for preserving the humility and happiness of men. To be sure, a knowledge of his blunders may make a man humble, (though not always) but it seldom makes him happy.* This by the way.

"Sacred story," our writer goes on, "abounds "with instances of misapprehension among men "who, in the main, appear to have been pious and "sincere worshippers of the Almighty."

"Thus *even* Abraham (scarcely allowing him to have been pious† in the main) may have believed." Here the offering of Isaac is mentioned as Abraham's delusion, his attempt depicted as the horrid enthusiasm of a madman, and compared to the abominable sacrifices of children to Moloch: after which the writer, as usual, triumphs in his superior conceptions of what the Deity ought to command; exults in the unbounded spread of Gospel love, unfettered by a belief in such a record; asserting that (like his own and Hannah's religion, independently

* I sincerely hope our author himself will experience more *happiness* from his best intentions, whatever they may be, than can result from his own *blunders*, or, more certain, *misrepresentations:* With one or the other he is often chargeable.

† Piety of *intention* in the main is not disallowed in the "Considerations," to Abraham; nor is it a grammatical deduction here. Let the writer look again.

of *any reliance* on Scripture) "it rises, flows, and actuates."

As the professed object of this writer is to shew that Hannah may yet be reunited to Friends, so it is *mine* to shew* that he has more clearly manifested the chasm which continues to separate them. In this case he has done it completely; and on this subject Hannah's favourite author Penn, when treating, in that piece which the Society has most of all espoused, when treating I say, in *No Cross, no Crown*, of practical piety, adduces this story of Abraham as an awful, undoubted, instructive fact. As my view in these remarks is not so much to prove that Hannah's notions are unsound, as that they continue different from those of Friends, I may leave the Bible to plead, in this case, its own cause; but I can scarcely forbear mentioning another reason which may probably occasion a more inveterate dislike in sceptics to this passage, than to some others; namely, its connection with Christianity.

Not that I expect any argument drawn from the scriptures can convince any, who, like Hannah, *garble*† them at pleasure; to such they are a rule neither primary, nor secondary, but over-ruled themselves by the reader's will; nevertheless, I wish those who yet are not settled in the plenitude of *her* confidence, to remark the context of this passage: "And the Angel of the Lord called unto Abraham "out of heaven the second time, and said, By my-"self I have sworn, saith the Lord, for because "thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld

* This account of himself is evidently true; and his professed object has been laboured at with as much *brotherly* regard, as Hannah Barnard has ever had cause to thank him for.

† This word *garble* is a pretty full proof of his *brotherly* construction of the distinctions she may have made, in the import of scripture testimony! She never appeared, to persons of candid observation, to be of a *garbling* disposition.

"thy son, thine only son, that in blessing, I will "bless thee; and in multiplying, I will multiply "thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand "which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall "possess the gate of his enemies, and in thy seed "shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, *be-* "*cause* thou hast obeyed my voice." Gen. xxii. 15 to 18.* This blessing of *all* nations in the seed of Abraham can refer to no circumstance recorded in any history, but to Christ. The accomplishment of that part of the prophecy which relates to an innumerable progeny, is not only satisfactorily recorded in Scripture, but a branch of Abraham's family, the same branch in which arose the Saviour Jesus, is still continued in the Jews; whose mi-

* Admitting, for argument's sake, that Divine wisdom did, in an extraordinary instance, see meet to *try* Abraham's obedience in a way different from his general laws of trial and obedience, and by a *suggested* act, which he would not allow Abraham to perform; still, this must be something different from a *positive command:* and what did Hannah Barnard, or what does any one of her Friends, say more?—If, in pursuing the subject, our author will lay particular stress on the word *because,* and insinuate that *because* of Abraham's willingness to have *obeyed,* the Divine Wisdom then *first* formed a resolution to bless the seed of Abraham, by giving them temporal prosperity, by outward conquests, possession of enemies' *gates,* &c. this remains to be yet performed, in any extensive and durable sense. The contrary now is, and for many ages has been, evident: and it would be a series and kind of prosperity totally different from the nature of Christianity, as explained by Christ himself, in the most uniform, emphatic, and solemn manner. As to the general history of the Jews, their continuance as an extensively-scattered part of mankind, and of the continuance of any particular constituent *family* among them, who attempts to deny? And taking these as facts, what do they prove, respecting the divine origin of Jesus, his exalted offices as Teacher, Redeemer, and Saviour of the world, —characters originally glorious in the divine design, before Abraham, or the first of men, existed; and which, independently of a thousand generations of Jews, or of any people, will doubtless so continue to the end of time!

raculous and unparallelled preservation, amidst the wrecks of their country, the contempt of their conquerors, and the brutal usage of subsequent states called Christians, furnish an evidence to the authenticity and truth of the Old Testament, which, I believe, infidels have not yet been able to shake: While by the prophecies of the Old Testament, respecting the Messiah, which are unequivocally shewn to be inapplicable to any other than to Jesus, on whom, as on a focus, they unite; these Jews, the descendants of those who crucified Christ, form no mean part of the evidence of New Testament Christianity; derived to us through the blessed medium of Abraham-descended, and heaven-descended, Jesus.

4. We come next to the favourite topic—the *Jewish wars*. It is thus ushered in, "Again, it is "not to be denied, that the Old Testament abounds "with accounts of contention, violence, and slaugh-"ter, most painful to the feelings of the truly reli-"gious mind:—that mind which has studied in the "school of Christ, which has learned to breath in "the element of love, the pure unpolluted element "of GOD's eternal nature; for 'GOD is Love!'

Indeed our writer, whether he has a truly religious mind or not, seems to wish to evince *his* pain and his aversion from the records of those events, by the terrible outcry which he raises for several successive pages, wherein no epithet seems too full to set forth, on one hand, the blackness of the recorded transactions;* or, on the other, to induce our belief that he and his anti-scriptural friends are plentifully inhaling the pure ether which he describes. But it seems all the while strange to an old-fashioned Christian,

* This, from the *general* description used, is certainly too strong an imputation against his opponent to pass as candid or true. But it is a licence which cannot be prevented, where men are determined to say more than is proper.

that this grievous cry should be pretended to have been learned in the school of Christ.* We cannot be *sure* that our writer excludes the New Testament from that school, because he sometimes quotes it. If he did, there would be an end of him, as an advocate of Hannah towards a Christian society. If he do not, he must allow *us* to read now and then a lesson in it, and to account it a part of the instruction of the school of Christ. Let him take his choice of either of these alternatives. I shall, for the present, proceed upon the last. Now although, to be sure, we have been brought up from our *tender years*† in a sort of veneration for the *Old* Testament, we are mightily strengthened in the respect we bear to it, by the encomiums on it which we find in the *New*. We are much prepossessed it its favour by the familiar use made of it by Christ and his Apostles.§ Law, Prophets, Psalms, all are quoted. Not a word of "delusion," "painful feelings to

§ It may not be amiss to remind those who have not had occasion to observe for themselves, that whenever the Scriptures are mentioned in the New Testament, the Old Testament is meant. Also, that the Old Testament was divided by the Jews into the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. The Law reached, I think, to Nehemiah inclusively; the Prophets were Isaiah, &c. to Malachi; and the Psalms included Proverbs, and I believe, Solomon's Song.‡——*Considerations considered.*

---

* An old-fashioned Christian, as well as any new-fashioned one, might be more likely to learn it in that school than in any other. It is peculiarly the school of peace, long-suffering, and rejection of all motives to violence: and this school, like the kingdom of the Master, was always the same.

† A reference to our *tender years* is rather unfavourable to a hard-hearted and full belief of the *Divine authority* of all the OUTRAGE and most HORRIBLE SLAUGHTER which have been imputed by the Jews to the *command* of that GOD and Father of Love, who has often denounced his judgments against violence. I like this reference to *tender years!*

‡ This piece of information is not amiss in the intention. It may be well to guard poor ignorant sceptics against all kinds of misconception. But the uniform divinity of *Solomon's song* is not fully vouched for, which is also very proper.

"religious minds," and commands for "general "butcheries." On the contrary, the great Master of this blessed school* bears testimony to its dignified office in that it "testified of *him*." One Apostle says, it is able to make wise unto salvation, thro' faith. All quote it, or refer to it, as carrying conviction in its very name. But the following considerations, independently of the esteem in which Christians hold the Old Testament, are conclusive in forbidding them to reject the Mosaic account of the Jewish wars, or even to be offended at it;† not having yet learned with our writer, to pronounce positively (whether reverently or irreverently, may be a subject for him to consider) what the Almighty cannot do. There is no character which is recorded in the Old Testament, which appears to be marked with more approbation by Christ, than that of Moses. His word in one place is called the word of GOD,‡ Mark viii.; a disbelief of him is given as a reason

* Does our author mean to call Jesus Christ, the great Master of the blessed school of all the Old Testament transactions? HE came into a more special presidence in *his* school, with far different lessons from those which our author would make divine; and announced his precepts of *peace* with—*a new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another:* And the Apostles, who studied profoundly in it, bear this testimony to the eternal principle of Christianity, *old things are passed away, all things are become new, and all of God;* plainly intimating that *many old things were not of God:* This the sincere lovers of the Gospel of Christ must be allowed to believe.

† If they are *offended at it*, we would not, merely for that reason, be offended at them. We are not so properly said to be *offended* at such accounts, as at those who would reproach us for not receiving them as wholly divine, and as divinely binding on the faith of Christians. And we are not ashamed to make such, to us, important distinctions.

‡ This is not a correct statement of the fact. It was not *the word of Moses*, which our Saviour quotes; but a *commandment*, which is called also the *word, of God himself:* This, in common with the other *commandments* in the decalogue,

which prevented a belief in Christ, John v.; he was one of the persons who were with Jesus in the transfiguration, Matthew viii. Mark ix. Luke ix.; and it is said, that even a voice from the dead could not be more powerful* than that of Moses and the Prophets, Luke xvi. In short, he is marked by his Divine Antetype, the blessed Jesus, strongly marked with the stamp and character of a true prophet. Who shall then call this character in question? This, however, we must do, if we dispute his veracity. There is no medium. He is the recorder† of these awful events. He doth not always simply relate them, but attests to the truth of the narrative the name of the Lord: see Numbers i. 1, 2, 3, x. i. 2, 9. xxi. 34, 35, compared with v. 23 and 24, xxv. 16 to 18. xxxi. 1, 2, 7, 8, &c. 21, 25, &c. xxxiii. 50 to 56.

If he be mistaken, however good his intention may have been, his prophecy is false. We cannot avoid this difficulty. The notion of a mistake, which I know Hannah has started, may be a salvo for Moses against actual sin; but still we make him as-

had been given only *through* Moses, as the *instrumental* lawgiver to the Jews. This agency of Moses was undoubtedly high; but let us not make the commandment of God into the *word* of a human being, to dignify any human character.

* This, again, is not strictly true. The parable states the degree of disbelief in which the parties were, to be such, that if *they* would not be persuaded by the testimony of Moses and the Prophets, *they* would not believe, though one should rise from the dead; but it does not say that a message by such a messenger *could not be more powerful* in itself. After all, it was the Divine spirit and authority contained in any testimonies, *through* Moses and the Prophets, which constituted the *power*. So far as reverence was ever paid to Moses *as a person*, it had been deemed idolatrous, and reproved.

† This is not so certain as to justify our author in positively asserting it, against the opinion of some scholars—unless, indeed, he believes it *revealed* to him; but whether Moses or some other person penned the Pentateuch, is not material.

sert falsehoods in the name of the Lord; and thus we bear an opposite testimony to that of Jesus. Is this having learned in the school of Christ? Is this to breathe a purer element than our fellow-men? Is it not rather inhabiting a land of mist, wherein even consequences not very remote from the circumscribed prospect on which we strain our eyes, are not discovered, until, by proceeding in the scanty twilight, we fall into the ditch of error, absurdity, denial of Christ, and irreligion?* As this outcry against the Jewish wars seems to be a principal bait for catching the minds of the simple, for leaping away from a reliance on the authenticity of Scripture, and peculiarly adapted to take in a society, so abhorrent from war as that of Friends, so the point is laboured with considerable diligence; but as I hope to shew, with more diligence than consistency. After some descanting on the immutability of the Supreme Being, the writer reminds us that "all men may err." Some deviations from absolute "truth, especially "respecting the inscrutable œconomy of the Infi-"nite Being, may take place in all men who under-"take to judge on the positive side of supernatural "operation in the government of the universe. The "first, the least imperfect of the reporters of human "events, of whatever kind, must have been a crea-"ture at an *awful distance* from the perfection of "God himself; and his testimony, however posi-"tive, *against the uniformity of the Divine good-"ness and compassion,* must be uncertain in pro-"portion."

* This laboured period of metaphorical *mist*, *twilight*, and *ditches*, seems intended to be awful; but metaphor on his part, and imputed irreverence on ours, both aside, I must remark, that none are more likely to be in danger of falling into error, than your boundless believers; those who are in the habit of literally believing, as divine, the greatest quantity they can. But be it remembered, that this remark is under the head of the *Jewish wars*.

Before I proceed to shew the inconsistency of this writer, I must advert to the particulars in the last-quoted paragraph. In the first place, it is to be remembered, that where man is admitted to partake of Divine inspiration, he is not then at that distance from the source of certainty, in which, as man, he naturally stands. It is nonsence to suppose a revelation, without conceiving a sufficient approximation of Divine intelligence to give certainty. The argument, therefore, drawn from the imperfection of man, must for ever be inconclusive to believers; for it would be trenching upon the attributes of Omnipotence to say, that he could not with indubitable evidence and infallible certainty make known his will to any of his rational creatures.* In the next place, I would have it remarked, how smoothly is slipped in here the charge *against the uniformity of the Divine goodness and compassion.* But let it be remarked, that here the writer assumes as a truth, that to admit a Divine command for the Jewish wars would be to controvert the uniformityof Divine Goodness: an assumption, which Christians will by no means allow him.† In this place let me say, once for all, that it seems not becoming for us to call GOD good, for what he does; but to call this or that good because he does or wills it. Man, indeed, is the recipient of good, therefore he is, as he acts; but the Creator is the source of good, and his actions are all such.

* This is very true; and far be it from me irreverently to suppose the contrary. I have no where intimated any such thing. But I distinguish, and I wish my opponent would more clearly do so, between *God's power*, and human declarations concerning his use of it.

† I trust some very honest Christians will be found to allow me such a sentiment, with regard to some things set down in the name of the Lord on this subject. But if none could be found, I must remain a solitary mourner at the strange complexion of human credulity.

To return now to the general tenor of the remarks, and of the quotations which I have adduced, it is evident that they are intended to shake our confidence in those things, which (poor simple Paul thought) "were written aforetime for our learning,"* and this upon the supposition of great incompetency in man to judge on the *positive* side of supernatural operation. By the bye, I suppose, when new teachers incline to take the positive side of a proposition, we shall be told of poor man's fallibility in judging of negatives.† Here then the argument is from man's frailty and weakness; and if it takes, the business is done: the Rubicon is passed, and we may journey on, if we please, to the extent of the region of scepticism. But if we still continue unmoved, and unwilling to be cajoled out of our religion, up starts our humble antagonist, a creature of the same mould as Moses and all the prophets, whose fallibility he labours to prove, and tells us point blank, what his Maker *cannot* do, and what he may do.‡

* I doubt whether poor Paul, who had the divine office of making many rich, ever instructed his hearers that *every thing* said and written aforetime, as in the name of the Lord, was *necessary* for Christians to receive as such, before they could be good men, tender-hearted, and experiencers, not of the form, but of the power of godliness.

† This may possibly happen; and on some subjects with strict propriety.

‡ We are presented with so much allusion to this article, that I must again remark upon it. Is it possible to suppose, that I, or any reasonable being, ever spoke of *physical* power in the Fountain of all power? With God, in a reverent sense, all things are possible, which do not imply a positive *contradiction:* If *that* be involved in any proposition, even respecting Infinite Power, it must be false: We need not say, *because Infinite Power cannot do whatever it will;* but because his *will*, which is itself his *power*, is infinitely pure and perfect; there being in it no contrariety or possible shadow of turning. Hence the Scripture phrases,—He *can-*

I heartily wish among the many instances which these new teachers give us of the fallibility of man, that they would remember they are fallible themselves, and thence learn to be humble, and to avoid speaking positively on subjects, which finite comprehension cannot contain. Such are the qualities of GOD: I say qualities, because attributes are only what we ascribe to him. And I believe it will be found that there is need for such a caution on the part of those of our writer's stamp.*

Some deviations from truth may take place in men who undertake to judge on the *negative* side of the question, respecting supernatural operations. For if we deny that the Deity can do this or that, command the Israelites to destroy the Canaanites for instance, we deny *his* free agency (for which power in *man* Hannah is so strenuous) and make him act from necessity. It changes our ideas of GOD, or rather it destroys our ideas of him, as the uncaused cause of all things, and presents him to us (far be the irreverent conclusion) as himself the subject of a superior power.† Impious thought!

not lie, Tit. i. 2.—He *cannot* deny himself, 2 Tim. ii. 13.—He *cannot* be weary, Isa. xl. 28.—He *cannot* be found out, Job xi. 7.—He *cannot* despise or oppress the work of his own hands, or shine upon the counsels of the wicked, Job. x. 3.—He *cannot* be tempted to evil, neither tempteth he any man, Jam. i. 13, 14.—His hand *cannot* be shortened, Isa. l. 2. and lix. 1.—He *cannot* repent, Numb. xxiii. 19.—He *cannot* change, Matt. iii. 6.

* Yes, and of every stamp, especially those who are disposed, in substance, to be quite as positive about *qualities*, as we ever were about *attributes*.

† I do not admit this consequence of the *necessary* perfections of, which precludes all variableness in, the Divine nature. *Free* or other *agency* may apply to *man*, as a constituted being; but (with reverence be it spoken) it seems improper to apply it to the Infinite Being himself, to whom all *agency* is subservient.

If, on the other hand, we say, he may punish a guilty nation by what means he sees meet, he might (but I desire to feel the need there is of holy awe, in speaking of him at all) he might punish Canaan by Israel, and give to Israel the commission of destruction.

I have mentioned the exclusion of the Scripture from the grounds of re-union which our writer lays down. Scripture is indeed a bulwark against Deism. Scripture must, therefore, be battered and dismantled. And let our new teachers say what they may, Deism,* if not their aim, is really the point to which their labours tend. I know that some of them amuse themselves with a resting place somewhere on the road; but let them remember, the road is a declivity which grows steeper as they advance, till it completely hides the region of faith, from which they fondly recede; and the polar star which might conduct them again, like the star of old, to the low birth-place of that Christ whom they do not, even now, necessarily include in their Catholic church.†

This exclusion, and another discharge of the artillery of scepticism against the scripture, will be found in the following paragraph, which our writer

* Do, my controverting friend, tell us once for all, what our possible defect in the religious faith of blood and slaughter, several thousand years ago, has to do with *Deism.*

† If the indiscriminate belief of all this writer's divinity of the Jewish wars be "the star of old," by which he would guide us to the dispensation of Christ, I cannot wonder that he confounds and distresses himself on our account; but we do not see the shining, the guiding brightness, of this star; nor do we ever expect he will help us to a sight of it, in any position of its supposed altitude. But we humbly trust we have a surer guide to the spiritual birth-place of the Babe of Bethlehem; and that we have learned to include the matured authority of his peaceable dispensation, in our conception of the *Catholic church.* If we are deceived, the deception is too precious to be either abandoned or regretted.

subjoins to his considerations on the Jewish wars. "However improbable it may be, judging from the "various inconsistent opinions and records of past "ages, that all men should become agreed in their "faith and construction of *such historical records*, "it is at least worthily conceivable, that for religi-"ous purposes, all men may sufficiently agree, and "be satisfied in agreeing, on the great abstract prin-"ciples that *God is true*, and that *God is love;* "and hence find a safe, substantial, and peaceable "ground of union, for worshipping and adoring him, "the centre of all perfection, and the source of "all good. This should seem to be a foundation "broad enough for a full and permanent bond of "union, fellowship, and delight; and most surely of "acceptance with the GOD of the spirits of all flesh."

This passage appears to teem so much with absurdity and infidelity, that I have been hesitating which to advert to first. The Christian will observe, that as it makes no mention of Christ, it makes a belief in *him* no part of the commission to sit in this assembly. And yet Hannah calls herself a Christian, demands to retain the province of a Christian instructress, and this very writer is pretending to state means for her reconciliation with a Christian society!!!

But waving this, let us take a view of our new congregation. I believe, even Hannah herself could scarcely minister to the satisfaction of all. Into this assembly many persons might enter, who could readily assent to the two great abstract principles laid down, who would yet exceedingly differ on others, which they would think essential, and not to be given up. It would take in the Jew and the Christian, and I know not whether the Mussulman might not have a seat. Predestinarians and Universalists, Calvinists and Armenians, Trinitarians and Socinians,

would indeed be collected; but that so indiscriminating an inclosure would prove, broad indeed as it is, "a full and permanent bond of union and delight," requires, I think, some sense different from common sense to perceive.

In fact, while men continue to differ in religious opinion, as they now do, the most likely way for general peace is for them to class themselves according to their faith; for no class to exercise dominion over the rest; for their controversies to be managed with temper and moderation; and for no person to assume a right of teaching and remaining in a society, the ancient tenets of which he rejects, or which is not disposed to adopt the new ones which he may propose.

"The sincere members of such several societies, whatever may be, as says William Penn, the several liveries they wear here, may, it is to be believed, at length recognize each other, by the white raiment that will be their garb for ever.

5. The next topic which passes under our writer's review, is one concerning which Hannah has made a great stir, namely, what this writer calls the "*proper unity* of God, and the *notion* of a *satisfaction* for sins by *vicarious atonement*."

The chief part of what is said on this subject, is employed to insinuate that our ancient Friends considered these points as not being their principal concern to set forth. Granting this, (for it may be safely granted) because their adversaries were such as did not call forth their opinions by controverting these points, it does not therefore follow that their sentiments respecting them were the same as Hannah's; which is the thing to be proved. And from the acquaintance I have with their writings, I think they would not have spoken of these things in terms similar to those of her new apologist. They would

not probably have said of Jesus that he was dead,* that his name IMMANUEL, *God with us*, was only "the highest, of all figures;"† nor have chosen *designedly* to subjoin to the Scripture phrase "The "GOD and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," the words "as of all the families of the earth." These expressions indeed suit our writer's design, which is to induce a belief in the reader that our ancient Friends lowered the character of Christ nearly in the manner that Hannah has done.

There is no author, however, quoted to prove this, and, I believe, for a very good reason, namely, that there could not be; for surely could the writer's assertions, which are pretty positive, have been well backed with proof, he would scarcely have omitted it.‡

As the faith of our forefathers respecting Christ has been lately set forth in a small pamphlet by Henry Tuke, information on that subject is the less necessary here.

Suffice it then to say, that it was, as it is now declared to be in the summary, accordant with other

* Who, though outwardly crucified and *dead*,§ was still the messenger of light, life, and salvation, *inwardly* revealed. As if he had not risen outwardly; which, however, seems to be *obliquely* allowed further on.

---

† Is it not said, that "GOD was in Christ, reconciling "the world unto himself?" And "Christ in man, the Hope "of Glory?" Hence, (by the figure, which takes the *container* for the *contained)* Christ is emphatically called IMMANUEL, or *God with us*. Why should this description, then, give offence to a professor of orthodox Christian faith? —Would plain George Fox have cavilled? No!

‡ This is not wholly omitted in the *Rejoinder*.

§ I believe it would be too much for our Friend to undertake to prove, that in common acceptation of language, Jesus, after crucifixion, was not *outwardly* dead; (he was indeed pronounced to be so) or that, *spiritually*, he was not then alive. If those who can kill the *body* of man, cannot kill the *soul;* it surely was not fact, that the divine immortal soul of Jesus was otherwise than alive! I seek not the aid of *obliquity* on these topics: Independence never needs it.

professors of the Christian name, who esteem him to be the Messiah and Mediator of the New Covenant; who "believe in his miraculous conception, birth, life, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension, as recorded in Scripture; and who assert his divinity."*

There is one book namely, "William Penn's "Sandy Foundation shaken," which seems to be so much the boast of Hannah and her advocate, that it may be worth while to spend a short time in examining both what he says of it, and the circumstances of its memorable author at the time he wrote it. Our writer says it was "owned and adopted by "our ancestors." As to its being *owned*, if he mean that it underwent that revision to which Friends' books are now subject, before it was printed, I believe he will not find that to have been the case, the meeting to which such matters are referred not having arisen until 1673, whereas the "Sandy "Foundation, &c." was printed in 1668, as has been said. With regard to its *adoption* by the Society, I know of no action of theirs that can be called such, except the reprinting of it with the rest of Penn's works, after his death; but this was no more than candour in the editors of that collection; and was in some measure necessary, for satisfying

* This term *divinity*, as applied to Christ, seems to be used by this author, as by many others, with considerable ambiguity. If terms were fully defined, many controversies would be precluded. The *divinity* of Christ is much more generally and worthily held than many are aware of. I profess to believe in his divinity, in believing him to be *a divine person; the divine son, and sent of the father*. But to believe him to be *The Divinity*, in the sense in which the supreme Eternal Father is *The Divinity*, is a different article of faith; and at the same time, a sense in which the *Son of God* does not designate himself; but completely otherwise, as is elsewhere largely shewn, if words the most solemn and decisive mean any thing, from the sacred lips of Jesus!

the reader respecting the cause of one of his imprisonments; and also the better to introduce his "Innocency with her open face."

It is well known, that Penn had been engaged in a warm verbal dispute with some Presbyterians, who, not having given either sufficient time, or decent treatment, at an appointed conference, it induced him to write his "Sandy Foundation, shaken," as a further mean of exposing the dogmas which they had advanced, namely, the trinity of distinct persons, &c. the impossibility of sinners being pardoned without a plenary satisfaction, and the justification of impure persons by imputed righteousness. I do not know that it has ever been denied that he did indeed give these doctrines, as generally held, an effectual shake; but in so doing, he gave occasion for its being suspected that he denied the divinity of Christ. From this charge, therefore, he clears himself in his "Innocency with her open Face;" but as this book was written in prison, our writer, and those of his way of thinking, will probably say that it was written to be, as it proved, a passport to liberty. But in the first place, let it be remembered, that Penn was not a man to be deterred from his duty by the fears of prisons, into one of which he again was cast the year following his release from the Tower; and during his detention in the Tower, and at the very time that he had lost all prospect of liberty, while he was declaring that his prison should be his grave before he would "budge a jot," he spoke of the patience of Jesus in terms coincident with the tenor of Innocency, &c. He called him the author and finisher of the saints' faith, and little thought that he himself should be quoted in another age, in order to assist in the degradation of the character of the Messiah.

However it is not from the "Sandy Foundation "shaken," nor from "Innocency with her open

"Face," exclusively, that we are bound to draw the opinion of William Penn on doctrinal points. A writer who signs himself Christicola, in his *Observations* on Hannah's *Reply* to some *Remarks* on her *Summary*,* has adduced several pertinent quotations from other of Penn's works; but as these are of a date much later than the favourite tract, which is to be *nolens*, *volens*, the standard, I will cite a passage from one of Penn's books, written before it, but in the same year, 1668, and entitled "The Guide Mistaken." After some perplexing questions to a rigid *satisfactionist*, much in the spirit of the arguments in the "Sandy Foundation "Shaken," Penn subjoins as follows: "Thou "must not, reader, from my querying thus, con-"clude, we do deny (as he hath falsely charged us) "those glorious Three, which bear record in heaven, "the Father, Word, and Spirit, neither the infi-"nity, eternity, and divinity, of Jesus Christ, for "that we know he is the mighty GOD; nor what "the Father sent his Son to do on the behalf of lost "man, declaring to the whole world, we know of "no other name by which atonement, salvation, "and plenteous redemption comes; but by his "name are, according to our measures, made sensi-"ble enough of its mighty power; but rather to let "thee see how unsatisfactorily he (Clapham) has "imposed religion on the world, and how exceeding "open he has laid his principles to the objection "of every reasonable enquirer."

This last, in fact, is what Penn was also doing in the "Sandy Foundation shaken." He was then exposing his adversary, not declaring himself: there-

* One might be tempted to believe our writer had not seen Christicola's Piece, if we did not know that folks are apt to slur over what they cannot anfwer. Hannah did so with the *Remarks*.†

† This, whoever knows her, will be likely to consider as a *slur* upon her character.

fore it is probably, of all his doctrinal books, the least fitted to shew his general sentiments of the leading points of Christianity. The foregoing quotation from the "Guide Mistaken" is from ch. i. §. 14; the following, wherein he speaks also of his brethren, the primitive Friends, is from ch. ii. §. 5.

"They are so far from disowning the death and "sufferings of Christ, that there is not a people on "the earth that so assuredly witness and demon-"strate a fellowship therein, confessing before men "and angels that Christ died for the sins of the "world, and gave his life a ransom."

The reader may now see how little Hannah can avail herself of William Penn, and how little on the subject before us she resembles our ancient Friends.

As to the notions of *infinite unappeasable wrath, satisfaction*, and the like, which she combats with such zeal, they are not those of our Friends, ancient or modern; and not being such, we have nothing to do with them.

6. The last topic particularly considered is that of Miracles. I hope it is not necessary to be diffuse on that head.

A desire to invalidate the testimony which they afford, betrays a determination of what is called "free thinking," which feels itself curbed by the full admission of that testimony. Such a desire, however, is discoverable in this writer; he more than hints at the pretended miracles of the Papists, and though he doth not *dare* to impute imposture to the Scripture miracles, he declares it to be "lamenta-"bly chargeable on the general history of religious "miracles, and that its influence must be felt."

Under such circumstances he infers the folly of making a belief in Scripture miracles a qualification for a member of a Christian church; and conceives it possible for a public teacher of such a church to be sceptical in this respect, and yet fit to minister.

On this occasion, indeed, the deleterious pill appears to be neatly gilded; but its rank odour penetrates, as in other places, the deceitful covering. He says, "a question may worthily arise, whether even "among them (public teachers) a positive uniformity of belief, respecting all recorded Scripture "miracles, or the religious importance of them, "ought to be *sought* or expected; or whether it is "not wiser, that respecting *such* matters and *others* "which are *distinct* in their nature from *practical* "*principles* of real virtue and holiness, no impor- "tant ideas of society soundness of faith, or the "contrary, should be entertained."

In another place he speaks a little more out, and says, "It is certainly true, that no miracle, however "divinely real, can be in itself any positive proof of "any other fact or *principle of religion*."

Now, as I understand Hannah professes an undoubted belief in the personal appearance of Jesus on earth, and says that he was, though a man, like one of us, endued with the spirit without measure; I presume *His* word is to be taken, and with it I would compare the assertion just quoted, and the insinuation conveyed in the terms "such matters (*i. e.* "miracles, and *all others distinct* from *practical* "*principles*.") Now when John had "heard in "the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his "disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that "should come, or look we for another? Jesus an- "swered and said unto them, Go and shew John "again these things which ye do hear and see, the "blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the "lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead "are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel "preached unto them." Matt. xi. 2 to 5. It doth not appear, that he who knew how to appreciate miracles, and their connection with practical principles,

gave to John any other answer than an appeal to *his* miracles.

Luke vii. 21, adds, that he wrought divers miracles in the presence of John's disciples; and both evangelists subjoin his closing declaration, "Blessed "is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me."*

Let us again hear him, in the beloved disciple's account. "The works which the Father hath given "me to finish, the same works that I do bear wit-"ness of me, that the Father hath sent me." John v. 36. "Then came the Jews round about him, "and said unto him, how long dost thou make us "to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. "Jesus answered them, I told you and ye believed "not. The works that I do in my Father's name, "they bear witness of me." chap. x. 24, 25. "Be-"lieve me that I am in the Father and the Father "in me, or else believe me for the very work's sake." xiv. 11. "If I had not done among them the works "which none other man did, they had not had sin; "but now they have both seen and hated both me "and my Father." xv. 24.

By this time, I hope, the point is clear. Miracles have a direct connection with principle, and are of religious importance; they prove the commission of the teacher. This even the Jews allowed: "Rabbi, "we know that thou art a teacher sent from God, "for no man could do these miracles which thou "dost, unless God were with him."

In a religion of faith, and such is, I suppose, it will be allowed, the Christian Religion, the authority

* Any quotation of such plain and gracious words of Jesus cannot easily be misplaced; but it is not obvious that they are necessarily introduced here in opposition to my principles! The miracles of Jesus were not questioned—and the idea of *offence at them* was by no means imputable to me! But though I am wholly unintitled to such an imputation, it may still be allowed me to be somewhat *offended* at our author's manner and insinuation.

of the teacher implants and confirms the doctrine; and infidels well know, that if they admit the Scripture miracles, they have absurdities to encounter in their unbelief of other parts, which do little credit to their boasted rationality. Our writer has, however, admitted that transcendant miracle, the Resurrection, in order to apologize for incredulity by that of Thomas. I would, however, remind him, that Thomas was not, as he says, incredulous at the appearance of Jesus, but at a previous account from the disciples. I trust, indeed, that diligent reading their bibles would do our new instructors no harm.*

This attack upon miracles comes, therefore, well in the rear of their forces, as a kind of "forlorn hope." This attack in our writer is insidious, not open. He labours to shew in general the possibility of illusion, and brings in (as I have hinted) the Romish pretences, to prove that illusions have taken place. If we discover this artifice, we are told that miracles are not wanting in favour of true religion: Any thing in short seems to serve his purpose better than a clear, unequivocal, and full acknowledgment of the miracles recorded in the scriptures: miracles, the reality of which both the foes and the friends of the missions which they were designed to establish, have not pretended to deny.

* Very true: and the more diligently we *read* and *compare*, the less likely shall we be to agree with our author in some of his opinions. Respecting this incredulity of *Thomas*, although it arose not, at first, from observing the appearance, but from solemn report of those who had seen Jesus, this does not materially affect the general question. He professed his *doubts* in very strong and precise terms, which Jesus himself, when he was personally present, found it necessary to use particular arguments and admonitions to overcome; this was the *point* of *our* argument; and candour, added to *diligent reading*, might have helped our author to the fact. But the *letter* rather than the *spirit* of a subject seems to suit him best; and hence too many of his complaints!

7. I have now nearly reviewed the whole of this motley and inconsistent performance; not such in words, for it is uniformly cool and smooth, and uniformly sceptical. "His words were smoother than "oil, yet were they drawn swords." Psal. lv. 4. But it is, I think, inconsistent in this. It abounds with references and allusions to scripture, while its general tendency, and sometimes its avowed intention, is to lay scripture waste.

By the frequent appeals, however, which it makes to the Bible, it becomes the more necessary for the writer, and all of his class, to attend to the instruction which the Bible affords; instead of which, we find a great variety between the views attempted to be intruded upon us by *Hannah* and her advocates, and those of the writers of the New Testament; although this new advocate has in the "Considerations" in question given, it may be unwarily, to the Apostles the title of *inspired*. *Hannah*, he says, enforces her doctrines "by the precepts and sacred "example of Jesus Christ, and his inspired Apostles." Let us pay due reverence then to their writings, and all may yet be well. They certainly speak with confidence of things which *Hannah* endeavours to bring into doubt; they tell us of propitiation, atonement, and of cleansing by the blood of Christ. They refer to his miracles as undoubted facts, and to the Old Testament as an authentic record. This, I believe, will be at last the nearest way home, and is a way which is the most likely to convey Hannah into the cordial embraces of her Friends.

The Apostles, we find, imbued as they were with the belief, which modern sceptics have "the hardi-"hood" to undermine, were not unfurnished with their "testimony against the sins and abominations "of the earth;" and we also find even from heathen authority, that their converts were accordingly eminent for piety and holiness of life. So that, I be-

lieve the genuine religion of the bible* will not be found, to those who humbly receive it, any obstruction to the "stream of religious instruction, admonition, and encouragement in virtue," which may rise in their hearts, and flow forth in their doctrine, conversation, and lives.

* The sensible reader will naturally pause, at the end of this performance, and reflect on the often-violated and tortured meaning of this phrase, *The genuine Religion of the Bible!* —It must forcibly occur to him, that under *that* general description have originated and proceeded, on *professed* principle, most of the religious errors and enormities which have blinded and troubled mankind, for a long succession of ages. And yet the religion, the simple beautiful religion, of *divine inspiration*, of *the New Testament*, and of *Jesus Christ*, is not the less precious. Let us and our children study and cherish it!—But never, surely, on the whole, was any plain well-meaning writer more ambiguously censured, than I have been by this volunteer-antagonist! My composition is *motley*, because *uniformly sceptical:* It is *uniformly sceptical*, because abounding with *scripture quotations and doctrines*, in which I profess to *believe:* It is *licentious*, because *limited:* It is *anti-christian*, because *anti-militant*, and relying on the spirit of the Gospel: It is *infidel*, because it prefers above all other the language of Jesus—and acknowledges the *divinity* of his personal character just as *He proclaimed it!*

THE

REJOINDER;

BEING

Remarks on a Performance intitled "CONSIDERATIONS CONSIDERED," *relative to the Case of* HANNAH BARNARD, *and dated 3d Month* 1801.

By the Author of the "CONSIDERATIONS," &c.

THE writer of the "Considerations considered" seems to have proceeded on the idea that the author of the "Considerations" had written in *concert* with Hannah Barnard; and further, that he is one of a number of "new instructors," who are attempting to *lay waste the authority of scripture in general*, and propagate "Scepticism" and "Infidelity." Neither of these notions is true. I wrote without intercourse with Hannah Barnard, or any one else. I wrote even without her being privy to my intention; and consequently she is not answerable for any thing I have advanced, with a view to her vindication; neither will she be so on the present occasion.

To say that I have not written, or am not about to write, with a *desire* to depreciate scripture, or lay waste any thing *sacred*, might be to call on the doubtful candour of my opponent, in a matter which

I rather wish to *prove* to the satisfaction of *others*, especially of ingenuous persons, who may happen to be our readers. Neither should I be likely to continue my remarks at all, did I not hope for some further fruits of my labours, by the serious attention of the young and unprejudiced of both sexes; and the consequent advantage, *to them*, of making up their minds from proper reflection on such important topics. As a parent,—as one who feels a warm interest in the respectability and happiness of young persons,—as one who expects to give an account at the last day,—I have motives far superior to those of *foiling* in controversy.

My opponent has indulged himself in a spirit of strong invective,—if I may not say of religious slander,—against me and such as he classes with me; but who they are, save Hannah Barnard, I neither know, nor have the means of knowing.—This spirit I hope not to imitate; for whether it proceed in him from early and strong attachment to system, from spiritual pride, or from too little acquaintance with the nature of true charity, it certainly is not good. At what length I shall be led to rejoin, is uncertain; but I hope not to be *very* diffuse, especially as I think I may refer, without reason for dissatisfaction, to much of what I have before written.

For some few verbal criticisms scattered through his dissertation, I see, on review, but little cause; and therefore I shall have the less, even incidentally, to say about them.

For the greater ease of the reader, it may be best to continue my remarks in the numerical order in which my opponent has thought proper to follow me.

1. It is certainly right in my opponent to give me credit for some degree of brotherly "feeling" for Hannah Barnard, whom I consider as a woman very unnecessarily treated, as she has been, what-

ever epithet the Society may ultimately think proper to affix to that treatment. Whatever *he* may disallow me on the score of "sympathy" with *some* of the London Friends, to whom I consider *judgment*, on a respectable stranger, as an unpleasant work, is a matter of much indifference to me; it is sufficient that I know my own sensations and affections, and am satisfied about them.

The chief features of this first division are *two*, which in various shapes run through most of the writer's following pages, as common themes of his complaint and reproach, viz. my being engaged in a "common cause of Scepticism;" and my rejection of *scripture* as a foundation of argument and faith, except as it may happen "to quadrate with my "opinion." These being general and prominent charges, I shall make some remarks upon them, and the spirit which imputes them, before I proceed further.

That many instances of *Scepticism* and *Infidelity* may be found in this age, as well as in former ages, is undoubtedly true; and wherever they are not merely levelled at the weakness, presumption, and errors of religious professors; but against the being and most evident nature of the glorious GOD,—and of his Son JESUS CHRIST, the appointed light and life of the world; they are deeply to be lamented, and heartily condemned. But it is true, also, that there is, in this age, a kind of *fashion*, existing and spreading, of imputing the worst species of Scepticism and Infidelity, in a very random and uncharitable manner, to fellow men, and even to professed fellow christians—to all those, in short, who happen to differ from the imputers in some particular doctrines and principles. And thus a kind of rancour is engendered and spread, which injures the religious harmony of society; and, becoming propagated with an intemperate zeal among persons who can

draw the sword, is made the means of augmenting and inflaming civil discord, and is attended with the most direful effects.* Should it be said, as perhaps it will be, that these remarks apply not to any among the peaceable Society of Friends, and are therefore utterly superfluous, I dissent from a part of that opinion. I know *we* have a professed testimony against drawing the sword, or voluntarily aiding those who do; and I hope we are generally clear of wishing success to any party by means of the sword. But evil imputation is the same in the root, at all times, and among all communities; its effects are always of an evil tendency: and while we lament the disorder and desolation, which have been promoted in the fighting world by the ready use and abuse of the watch-words, *Scepticism*, *Infidelity*, and *Atheism;* I would caution my opponent (whether he will thank me or not) against indulging so freely in the calumniating style, directly or by imputation, against me and others whom he does not know, as well as against Hannah Barnard, whose conscience he has not explored. I am not a man who delights in pleading for Infidelity or Scepticism, in a bad sense; but it should be remembered, if the *real* rather than the *uncertain* sense of words is to be regarded, that there are numerous opinions and principles, held sacred by divers professed Christian churches, concerning which some of the most worthy among Friends, as well as other Christian believers, have been *Sceptics*, and even *Infidels;* and they have been so without supposing themselves the worse men or the worse Christians.

As to my *no farther admitting the scriptures to be a foundation of faith, than as they quadrate*

* This general remark was too well-founded at, and for several years prior to, the first publication of this tract. May the cause subside with the return of a Treaty of *Peace*, since entered into by the Governments of Europe.

with my opinion; what, in fact, does my opponent more, if his opinion, like mine, be *first* formed on what he supposes the tenor of those scriptures? Does he proceed on his own opinion so originating, or on the opinions of other men? I seek for no other foundation than scripture, as the basis of *my* religious faith, being well satisfied with abundant testimonies and edifying doctrines which I meet with in the sacred volume. But if I find some things therein, which appear, on the most serious consideration, to be more fit for a general and eternal foundation than others, with all the comments of men upon them, —more consonant with the nature and circumstances of man, more consistent with the revealed will of God, and the testimony of *his Son*, as well as, in my serious view, more honourable to both, and bearing the indubitable stamp of *their* respective *original* and *derived* authority; I must use those scriptures as such. This is a liberty which I claim and allow, which I would use with reverence, and with as much desire, I trust, to do rightly, as my opponent: this is a liberty which I conceive has been exercised by most contemplative and honest professors of religion, and may well be so exercised without any necessary *schism* in a well-ordered Christian church, agreeing in its public œconomy; a Christian church which has the worship of one eternal God, through the aid of his Son and Holy Spirit, for its object. This may be said to open a door for latitude and variety of private opinions about particular points; but what then? It opens a door for the quiet exercise of natural and religious rights,—for mutual esteem and confidence,—and secures, in the fairest manner, one general benefit, by means of those chief, and perhaps most important, exercises, about which there may be no disagreement.

As to the "great original truths" of scripture, about which, for the purpose of religious unity, I have thought it may be sufficient for us as a Society to be agreed; they, indeed, may *abound*, in substance, through the Old and New Testament, and cannot be expected to be numerously set down here. I have in my former manuscript offered several, which then struck me as comprehensive enough for man, who would wish to be content with such a summary of divine law, as Divine Wisdom had thought fit to express with peculiar force and solemnity. I was not happy enough in those quotations, and in my serious opinion concerning them, to satisfy my opponent:—I need not here repeat those summaries, because if *they* were defective, I am willing to recommend what may be abundantly sufficient of itself; and that is, a cordial agreement with respect to the tenor of the *Sermon on the Mount*. This I adduce, not so much on account of *new* doctrine, in the substance of that divine discourse; or of excellence which was not before expressed or implied; but to shew that an increase in the *quantity* of excellent principle may be assigned for the purpose in view, and yet in so compact a state, that the test would be at once easy, solemn, and secure.

About a free, as opposed to an *hireling*, ministry, and the propriety of silent waiting on the Supreme Being, as the Master of religious assemblies, for the aid and influence of his Holy Spirit in the exercise of ministry, there is among us a general agreement; however short we may sometimes fall of realizing the high advantage of that principle—and short enough we do fall!

Now these things considered and assented to, as I have no doubt they are, in the minds of those who, though not named with me, may be alluded to by my opponent, as *sceptical*, and as *new instructors*;

it would follow, in the estimation of fair and candid readers, that they are not persons who can have any "secret intention to overthrow the Christian faith." Neither will they appear like persons who wish to shrink from the "record and standard" of the scriptures, in matters of social duty, of necessary faith, or holiness and salvation.

My opponent's chief pleadings for more *systematic* and particular articles of faith, and his more particular notions of "Scepticism," I shall endeavour to notice, as properly as I can, in the following divisions.

2. Our author, in this division of his comments, professes to agree with me about the prime scope and general tendency of the labours of our ancient friends, *i. e.* in promoting the *inward substance of religion*, as the great essential business. In this I am glad we agree; much depends upon it:—and I wish its importance may increase in the general estimation, to the lessening of cavils about more exterior and historical matters. But when he tells us of *my general remarks* of this sort, "which must insure assent "although they convey no precise idea," I confess it is difficult to understand him. Our forefathers were not without precise ideas, when they treated religion as an inward work,—believing that "who "soever feareth God, and worketh righteousness, "is accepted of him," This principle led them into a strong and peaceable dependence upon God, from whom, through the inward revelation of the Eternal Spirit, they derived their "wisdom, righteousness, "sanctification, and redemption." I do not say (and I know better than to say) that "they did not "attend to doctrines at all." Neither have I said, or intended to imply, "that they *undervalued* the outward testimony of scripture;" but that, though they thought highly of its usefulness, they considered (and such was the fact) the influences of the Holy Spirit, divinely afforded to man, as the superior and

"only adequate rule of faith and manners." And by consequence, that there was a degree of *imperfection* and *uncertainty*, in the *letter* of scripture, against which the superior principle was, and must be, the great illuminating security, as well as the great regulator of faith and duty to individuals. We were not ignorant of the chronological order of Friends' publications; but we find nothing in the *tenor* of those books, which invalidates the statement above made. Neither, on the other hand, will serious considerate men be likely to believe that more was not said about *doctrines*, by *some* of the early controversial writers among Friends, than was conducive to the general prosperity of the Society, and the best advancement of their Christian cause; but they were *men*, though mostly *good* men; and their *general* testimony was a noble application of sacred writ. Our author's solitary quotation from Isaac Pennington, to shew the early sentiments of Friends respecting the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, seems to have been unhappily chosen, viz. That he had heard one of the *antient ones* publicly declare, "that if Christ had not come in the flesh in the "fullness of time, to bear our sins in his own body "on the tree, and to offer himself up a sacrifice for "mankind, that all mankind had *utterly perished*." This may have been the opinion, however formed, of some well-meaning pious individual; but *where is the scripture authority for such language?* Or where is the worthiness of such a consequent imputation cast on the all-wise, all-powerful, and all-good Creator of the world, the God of the spirits of all flesh? Would our modern Friends wish to have such testimonies revived, and be publickly proclaimed for the credit and edification of the church? I charitably hope they would not; and that we can produce better proofs of sound faith, and sound judgment, in Isaac Pennington: he

was, doubtless, a good man, but seems to have been at *that* time in the wane of his days, and to have quoted this antient preacher chiefly for the *singularity* of his doctrine. This opinion may be considered, by my commentator, as another instance of *scepticism*; but I believe, if he could try an experimental enquiry on the good sense and piety of all our most serious brethren, at this day, he would find them generally averse to the admission of so bold an article of Christian divinity! Whatever blessings man ever received, or can receive, for his present or future state, he must have derived, and will continue to derive, from the original, omnipresent, infinite Source of all possible good,—independently of whose perfect and eternal *will*, nothing ever originated, or shall originate, that is of a divine or gracious nature. The tender mercies of the Father of all Creation have been EVER *over all his works*. To say or suggest, therefore, that HE is *limited* in his operation, like as a poor fallible creature; or, that he has but *one way*, in which a gracious event can be brought about,—an event which originally and necessarily belonged to Him, and in which his glorious attributes are concerned,—argues extreme presumption indeed, or the most lamentable ignorance or forgetfulness of first and eternal principles! And yet in such a situation would our Society be at once involved, if the spirit of the quotation in question were to be sanctioned by them as a people; but I trust they will be aware of the modern danger this writer would prepare for them, by his inconsiderate gleanings of pretended orthodoxy. It becomes us to think and speak with all due reverence and gratitude of the appointed offices, and the sufferings, (appointed or voluntary) of the Holy Jesus; but I wish many in the Christian world at large, and some among us, were more sober and scriptural in their understanding and treatment of that memorable

event. No subject of reverent thankfulness seems to have been treated with more strange extravagance, to have given cause for greater revolting of irreligious persons from the most serious or sacred concerns; or to have given rise, under the management of priests and enthusiasts, to more idle superstition among some, and more false security and unworthy notions of GOD among others.*

As to our writer's censure of my quotation of Christ's important reference to the first and great commandments, and my character of the passage, Matt. xxii. 27; I see no cause, either from the nature of the subject, or the words of Christ, in that or any other place, to alter my language. It is intimated that I have omitted Christ's own more simple eulogy—"On these two commandments hang "all the law and the prophets." What copy of my "Considerations" my opponent may have read, I know not; but certainly that which went from me

* This has been exemplified by many well-meaning Protestant teachers, as well as in the Romish church. It is a blemish in piety, which, as it has hitherto prevailed but little, I hope may never become introduced and remarkable *among Friends*. It is with far other sentiments than those of levity, that I here quote an instance to shew to what absurdity this kind of systematic piety may be carried, under the idea of orthodoxy in Christianity. It is from that eminently pious Scotch non-conformist, S. Rutherford, a man who suffered various imprisonments, and obtained much reputation for zeal and soundness of faith in the Christian cause. Writing to his brethren of the inestimable benefits of Christ, but with few explanatory ideas of the subject, he says,

"If it were possible that heaven, yea ten heavens, were laid "in the balance with Christ, I would think the smell of his "breath above them all: sure I am, he is far the best half of "heaven; yea he is all heaven, and more than all heaven: and "my testimony of him is, that ten lives of black sorrow, ten "deaths, ten hells of pain, ten furnaces of brimstone, and all "exquisite torments, were all too little for Christ, if our suf-"fering could be a hire to buy him."

contained this simple eulogy. It was no object with me to endeavour to conceal the words of Jesus, which were at once emphatic in themselves, and much to my purpose. As to their making "an "opening for something more," in order to include the character of a *Christian*, *i. e.* a belief in Christ, as the *Mediator*, *Redeemer*, and *Saviour;* I have this to say, and I wish it may be attended to, for I contend not for the shadow, but the substance of things—not about verbal distinctions without an essential difference. If (as I conceive to be the fact) the commandments to perfect *reverential* and *social* love, as referred to in "the law and the prophets," include the *spirit* of christianity, and every thing, essentially, which Jesus afterwards proclaimed as obligatory on his disciples, and as the qualification for his kingdom; then is the definition of that love, as a "summary of whatever had been or could be "obligatory, as the pure undefiled religion of man," correct. Love is not only the *fulfilling of the law*, but the very essence of the Gospel. It was not because man had essentially *more to do*, that Christ came and took a bodily appearance to *teach* him; but because the far greater part of men had failed, and was failing, to receive and be governed by the principle of eternal righteousness contained in the law, and was in the spirit of omission and transgression. Christ was spiritually and substantially before man; and existed from his Divine origin, in all his offices, as "Mediator, Redeemer, and Saviour;" and whosoever believed in God, and obeyed his eternal law of love, (administered by the spiritual agency of his son) or fervently desired so to do, believed also in the spirit of the dispensation and kingdom of Christ!

I should be less disposed to follow this writer in *verbal criticism*, were it not that something more than grammatical credit depends upon it. He ridicules my phrase, "Belief about Faith;" terms it

tautologous; and goes on to insinuate that I have jumbled together certain unanalogous words, without any distinct ideas; or if not, that I was *dark* and *sophistical,* in order to deceive the simple. Now my evident object was to remark, what is certainly true, a vast variety of strange and contradictory doctrines that have prevailed in the world, about certain topics of disputation, which I then enumerated; and the consequent evidence it furnished of the weakness and uncertainty of human "belief" on those topics. Among them was "*Faith.*" Most reading persons know what contention has prevailed about the nature, design, quantity, and virtue, of this article; and what pains have been taken to excite and regulate *Belief* about the *Faith* of others. Where, then, is the *tautology* or the inaccuracy of my phrase? If my brother Critic will preserve equal correctness in all his descriptions and opinions, I will not complain of *him.* As to the charge, that, if not studiously ambiguous, I have jumbled words together without any distinct ideas; I have only to remark, that I certainly had as many distinct ideas, when I wrote the paragraph in question, as there are in it substantive words of different meaning; and I presume the uncaptious reader has had the same distinct variety, without thinking it necessary to suppose me sophistical, and that for an ill purpose. According to our author's style of *sacred criticism,* a man who should occasionally put into one sentence or paragraph *blackness* and *whiteness, religion* and *vice, wisdom* and *folly, heaven* and its *opposite,* might endanger his credit for common sense, or incur the imputation of "Scepticism." Instead of wishing to mislead the simple by *dark sayings,* I would gladly address, with the light and clearness of fair argument, those who not only have, but who are willing to use, a superior understanding. If a man *will not* understand me in plain language, I would

not, *for his sake*, wish to contend with him; but I would caution my opponent against endeavouring to fix on me either *Scepticism* or *Sophistry*, which he has no right to infer.

Our author concludes this head with a kind of whole-length picture of those he calls "Sceptics." He has seen some *sober* and perhaps *good* people, who differed in opinion from himself; and this seems to have been too much like a sufficient reason for setting them down as *Infidels*, and opposers of the Christian Religion. "They lay claim (he says) to "great piety, and violent veneration for the Supreme "Being." "They affect great candour and cool-"ness." "They appear to melt with benevolence "and pity over the miseries of men." It should seem as though this man had seen pretty good company, by whom he might have received improvement; but ungraciously retired with a disposition to abuse them. Again, "Zeal does not seem to be "one of their weapons." I wonder he had not discovered something of *temperate* Zeal, that being the common attendant of "Candour and Coolness." Perhaps some of them may find themselves so "zeal-"ously affected always in a good cause," as to be able to give an account of the faith and hope which are in them, without embarrassment, or fear of *his* weapons. They may have no objection to *zeal*, in due moderation; but it is sometimes *ravenous*—often *slanderous*. The Psalmist complains of it thus:—"I am become a stranger unto my brethren, "and an alien unto my mother's children. For the "*zeal* of thine house hath eaten me up, and the "reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen "upon me."—I omit any particular application. Some of my readers will make it without difficulty, but not without regret. So far as I, and any friends of mine, are implicated in the *picture*, I hope we may lay claim to *sincerity* in what we feel and pro-

fess, unimpeachable of *affectation*. If we "exalt Reason to the skies," it is because it came from *above* them; and we would not degrade the boon, when it may be improved and brightened by superior influences. And so long as we heartily subscribe to the general privilege and benefit of those influences, I hope we shall not materially err on the other hand, by maintaining the "Fallibility of Man." How far we are chargeable with urging it improperly, on any occasion, remains to be more clearly shewn, by our friend's better evidence.

If we are intended to have any of his sarcastical credit for *Piety*, *Veneration for the Supreme Being*, *Candour and Coolness*, and *melting at Misery*, &c. we will not, in these times, complain. Too many are placed in a far worse situation. For my own part, I confess I have learned somewhat of the *Christian* propriety of these affections; and if I have companions in such error, with similar views and feelings, I hope we shall not be easily censured or bantered out of them. I am one of the last men who need be accused of appearing to limit the attributes, or the "qualities," of the Almighty, as though He were not a God of purity and justice, as well as of infinite benignity. But I see, feel, and am constrained to adore, the visible attributes of his wisdom and unspeakable beneficence; and I hope ever to read with reverence and delight the definition that "God is Love." In that solicitude, also, I trust I am not unaccompanied by such as Hannah Barnard; and that this feeling and solace of our minds are not inconsistent with a love of Jesus, in affections the divine resemblance of the Father, and in whom we read the Father is well-pleased. From whatever I have observed and learned of the effects of religion, real and professed, in the world, there is no principle, or combination of principles, so powerful in its tendency to excite adoration of the Supreme

Being, and to increase harmony and heavenly affections among men, as a constant sovereign sense of the LOVE of the Heavenly Father. We cannot proceed under better persuasions to notice what follows.

3. This third division is mostly employed in apparent endeavours to fix the strongest stigma of *Infidelity* or *Scepticism* on Hannah Barnard, respecting the *Scriptures;* and that because her Apologist, as he calls me, happens to think that the scripture account of Abraham's intended sacrifice of his son is involved in such serious difficulties of belief, as that it is probable some error has crept into the statement, or some wrong sense has been understood. And such a suggestion on my part being intolerable; and I, without knowing them, being supposed to have written *her* sentiments, she must be implicated in all the supposed guilt, and share most of the calumny. But if (as he seems to think) she gave an opinion on this topic, less exceptionable than my unhallowed opinion, I think he may receive it as her sincere one; for I do not consider her as a woman likely to profess in one sense, and believe in another. For my own part, not having written hastily, or with any fear of avowing my belief, I continue to think, since I read our author's remarks, just as I did before; and am equally decided in my mind as to the soundness of my strictures on the detail. I continue to think that it is involved, if literally understood as *he* seems to understand it, in so much inconsistent cruelty, so much violation of the principles of tenderness and justice, as founded on the whole *spirit* of the Divine law, which springs eternally from the Fountain of goodness, wisdom, and every excellence; that no power on earth should require a *literal* belief of it, as an absolute *command* from GOD. An absolute *command* from the Supreme Being, the Fountain of Truth, can only be

clearly understood respecting things required to be *actually done;* and proceeding on those unchangeable principles of righteousness, by which the Almighty determines things *fit* to be done. Of this, GOD, in his own infinite wisdom, is alone the supremely *perfect* judge; but he has been pleased so far to constitute man a percipient of his glorious nature—so far to reveal the law of it—as for him to be assured that his Creator and Governor will not lay his *commands* on him, as an intelligent and accountable being, in direct contradiction to his *own* revealed principles of *moral right!* In conformity to this rule, we elsewhere read an appeal of Jesus, thus:—"Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye "not what is right?" To preclude any useless comments on this rule, I do not suppose it to have been intended as applicable to *all possible* cases; but they are general words, ascribed to our Lord. They imply a great deal, as to the province and accountability of the human mind. I do not conceive, on the other hand, that it was impossible Abraham should have believed sincerely, however imperfectly, that such trial of his faith was assigned him; or that he *sinned* in acting on that apprehension. It is not said, elsewhere, that in so acting, he *did,* or essayed to do, an act of divinely required *righteousness,* but that his conduct "was accounted to him *for* righteousness;" and this distinction seems to be very remarkable. I do not know that Hannah Barnard ever stated a similar distinction; but if in substance she so conceived of this matter, it is not wonderful to me.—Neither can I deem it wonderful that many serious Christians, rather than profess a belief in the positive *will* and *command* of the Supreme Being to Abraham, *so* to sacrifice his Son, would submit to separation from any Society under heaven. But it is important to refer to the text itself, which commences the account in these remarkable words:—

"And it came to pass after these things, that God "did *tempt* Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham. "And he said, Behold, here I am. And he said, "take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom "thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, "and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one "of the mountains which I will tell thee of." And afterwards, when he approached the mountain, it is said: "And Abraham said unto his young men, "abide ye here with the ass, and I and the lad will "go yonder and worship, *and come again to you.*" Hence two things are evident; 1. That it was designed of the Almighty as a *temptation*—and how far this idea comports with that of a *positive command* actually to do a thing; or how with the position of the Apostle afterwards, "neither tempteth "he any man,"—it is extremely *difficult*, at least, to apprehend and believe. 2. That either Abraham believed he should *not* be required actually to slay his child, or the promise of *returning with him to the young men* would not be creditable to his *veracity*. If it should be urged, that his promise was made in the spirit of *prophecy*, as some have intimated; it does not appear that the promise of the Almighty on which it might be founded, had gone forth for the inspiration of Abraham: and the whole circumstances seem to have precluded, at that time, any such idea in the Patriarch. From such premises, I chiefly wish to draw, in addition to what I have said before, this conclusion—that there *is* that degree of difficulty in the detail, which may well weaken the idea of *certainty*, that all we *now* have is correct, and as it was originally *stated*, or intended to be stated, for fact and divine instruction: and that so much error of judgment has crept in, as to supersede the propriety of requiring, in order to sound faith, an unqualified implicit *belief* in the sense for which our author and others seem to contend. I

shall here say nothing on his quotation of the recorded speech of an angel out of heaven, and the *terms* contained in it relative to *the Divine determinations* upon the subject before us; for it would be endless to compare our different ideas about constructions of words; and where there is such an evident disposition to impute the worst, I would avoid ministering, unnecessarily, occasion to that disposition. Our author, to confirm his opinion that the Society of Friends antiently thought as he professes to do, about this matter, quotes the authority of William Penn, from *No Cross, No Crown:* but though he has reason to think I have considerable respect for the character of William Penn, my answer is, that in a matter merely of implicit faith, where he does not profess the exercise of the understanding, William Penn is much on a level with other men, and not invulnerable to error. This is not a remark for an evasive purpose, for I shall have to *exemplify* it very particularly in another place.

I have said above, "many serious Christians," for I humbly conceive it possible (however strange our author may think my opinion) that such absence of faith, such apprehensions of error, are fully compatible with the substantial character of a true Christian. A character which does not consist in, or necessarily require, a fundamental belief—for it does not strictly require the literary study—of all the verbal statements, of types and figures, contained in different passages of the Jewish history; but in the demonstrated divine excellency of the character of Christ—in the end of his coming—in the precepts of pure undefiled religion which he taught—and in the practice of them, by and through the assistance of the Holy Spirit. For, on the contrary, it is possible for people to spend much of their lives in professions of discovery, and belief about *types* of Christ, and to pass among men as sound believers

in what they superficially call *Christianity*, and yet be at a distance from the life and spirit of what they are continually talking about; being chiefly external professors and uncharitable calumniators of their brethren. Such persons would often think it strange, if it were supposed they had not a considerable share of sanctity, and had not been successful students in "the school of Christ." Whereas, if they were ever rightly initiated therein, they had need "to "learn again which be the first principles of the ora-"cles of GOD," as peculiarly taught in that school.

Taking up now conjointly the cause of *others*, who I may suspect are calumniated with me, let me say, with serious assurance of truth, that *we* believe as fully as our author, that "according to the de-"terminate counsel and foreknowledge of GOD," the Divine Messenger of a renewed and everlasting covenant of love and of salvation, was ordained to come into the world, to do his Father's will; that in the fulness of the appointed time he did so come, having been prophesied of by a succession of inspired prophets, and his kingdom of peace described; that in his coming, he brought life and immortality more fully to light; and that in the building of a general spiritual temple and church, he is and will ever remain "the chief corner-stone," and the holy heavenly High-Priest. We believe, that in suffering on the cross, he fulfilled that end of his mission; that in so dying, "he died for all;" and being buried, rose again, and spiritually ascended up into heaven, "leading captivity captive, and re-"ceiving gifts for men." In these and other points, as clearly recorded in the scriptures, we have not denied—we do not deny (as this writer would boldly insinuate)—but thankfully believe, and reverently acknowledge, "the blessed Jesus." It is not for the sake of this writer's favour that I think it worth while to come to such a confession; but for the sake

of truth, and for the sake of some of our brethren, who may be misled, and whose conception, in common with our characters, may be abused.

As to moral purity of life and intention, it is happy for us that we have nothing to do with this writer as our judge. There is one who judgeth him and us—that is GOD. To *Him*, as our Creator, and the Searcher of all hearts, we must make our ultimate appeal! Conscious of manifold infirmities, we have abundant need of *His* mercies, in whatever way he may be pleased to bestow them. But we are not afraid or ashamed to call on our antagonist, to shew some better proof, than he is doing, of his superior Christianity or more honourable and consistent faith.

He concludes this division of his dissertations, by giving to Jesus the appellation of "Abraham-de-"scended and heaven-descended Jesus." Now what is the exclusive honour of this? Have *we* denied that Jesus was "Abraham-descended?" But where is the peculiar dignity ascribed by this declamation? Are not thousands, and tens of thousands, of poor wandering *Jews*, "Abraham-de-"scended?"—Have *we* doubted that the Saviour of men is "Heaven-descended?" But where, again, is the peculiar honour of such a description? Is not *Man*, also, "Heaven-descended?" At so special an ascription of honour and dignity, we may not unwarrantably indulge a smile. It reminds one of another description, once bestowed on that dreadfully different character, *William Pitt*. He was called, not indeed a "Heaven-descended," but a "Hea-"ven-born" Minister! To be sure, the sense intended by the encomiast was a most vile abuse both of reason and language. But now it has occurred to our recollection, we will admit a sentiment or two, which seem to arise out of the character. This man has proved himself a great pleader against *scep-*

ticism, infidelity, and even *atheism;* but he has proved himself no great friend to practical Christianity; and affords a melancholy instance of orthodox pleadings! I hope our author would have acted far better, even if he had had the same education, and as much power. But the heart of man is said to be "*deceitful above all things;*" and Jesus once said to some of his pleaders, who were in reality his disciples, "*Ye know not what spirit ye are* "*of.*"—It may not be thought in character for a *sceptic* to quote the authority of such a Master; but I have a peculiar veneration for his words, when they *quadrate,* as they continually do, *with my opinion.* And I believe such sceptics as I am represented to be, can contemplate his sacred descent and character with much higher reverence than are suggested by the aforesaid undistinguishing epithets of our upbraiding Friend.

4. Touching the numerous remarks made in this division, on the enormity of the *Jewish wars,* it should almost seem a fact that my antagonist feels some apprehension lest the accounts of them in the Old Testament should suffer a loss of religious veneration among Christians. The manner in which I had spoken of them, as a painful subject of consideration, he terms a "terrible outcry," a "grie-"vous cry," &c.; and seems so much attached to their religious importance—so much at a loss to distinguish between their sacred nature and that of Christianity—that one might think he almost considered them as of a similar nature. He professes to be astonished that such persons as I appear to be, should talk of "the school of Christ;" but cannot be *sure* that I exclude the *New Testament* from that school, because *I sometimes quote it:* At any rate, that I am a most *inconsistent* pretender to religious principles, because I cannot see, as he professes to do, the necessary connection between Jew-

ish and heathen tragedies, and the peaceable benevolent doctrines of the *school of Christ*. He may well say, that if *I did reject the New Testament, there would be an end of me, as an advocate for Hannah Barnard;* and I wish him to be assured, that whatever good cause I may attempt to advocate, I shall never think of abandoning the strongest and most sacred ground. He intimates that he is mightily strengthened in his veneration for the Old Testament, by the *encomiums on it* which he finds in the New, and the *familiar use* of it made by Christ and his Apostles. He was speaking before of that part of the Old Testament which relates to the *Jewish wars*—the subject properly before him. Let him not wander from particulars to generals, and confuse the question; for I know not of any opponent he has in *a rejection of the Old Testament.* But here let me ask him, coolly, supposing him to have been reading lessons in the *New*, where he has found "the blessed Jesus," or any of his Apostles, passing *encomiums* on the *Jewish wars;* or making an uniform belief of every thing related, as to the progress and divine sanction of those wars, necessary to the spirit and character of a Christian disciple? This, I presume, he cannot do—and therefore much of his declamation, and affected condemnation of me and others, will fall to the ground. We agree that in the New Testament, *Law*, *Prophets*, and *Psalms*, are *all quoted*—and quoted with approbation too; but these quotations are mostly relative to a *typical*, as inferior to the *Gospel* dispensation; to prophecies of the Messiah's reign; and to pious sayings of individuals. And who denies these things? Or who has denied that the Old Testament is a treasury, in which abundant documents of Divine wisdom, and the most profitable and edifying precepts, are found? Precepts which proceeded from the Divine Origin of

unchangeable truth and excellency, and therefore truths "which are able to make wise unto salva-"tion, through faith." If I had associates in these remarks, I should say, We are not such children of impiety and absurdity, as to be blind or unfeeling to the clear consistent evidences of gracious communication. But if our *generalizing* brother would mean to say, and reproach us for not conceiving, that *all* parts and passages of the Old Testament are equally certain, important, and divine; or if he would say, with some zealous persons, of whom I have lately heard, who seem to make a merit of the abundance of their implicit faith, that every thing is equally or certainly true and divine, and correctly recorded and rendered, "from the beginning of "Genesis to the end of Revelations;" then, indeed, I for one, and perhaps many with me, may conscientiously dissent from such an opinion. Perhaps, also, we should not be without the respectable company of some of our ancient Friends, were they living to take a share in the question, especially Robert Barclay, who was aware of this kind of difficulty.—Sec. prop. iii. §. 4.

"Suppose all could read the scriptures in their "own language, where is there one of a thousand "that hath the thorough knowledge of the original "languages, in which they were written, so as in "that respect immediately to receive the benefit "of them? Must not all these here depend upon "the honesty and faithfulness of the interpreters? "Which how uncertain it is for man to build his "faith upon, the many corrections, amendments, "and various essays, which, even among *Protes-"tants*, have been used, (whereof the latter have "constantly blamed and corrected the former [Pa-"pists] as guilty of defects and errors) doth suffi-"ciently declare. And that even the last transla-"tors in the vulgar languages need to be corrected,

"(as I could prove at large, were it proper in this "place) learned men do confess. But last of all, "there is no less difficulty occurs, even to those "skilled in the original languages, who cannot so "immediately receive the mind of the authors in "these writings, as that their faith doth not at least "obliquely depend upon the honesty and credit of "the transcribers, since the original copies are "granted by all not to be now extent. Of which "translators Jerom in his time complained, that "*they wrote not what they found, but what they* "*understood.*"

I am taxed of irreverence, for hinting at things which the Almighty "*cannot do.*" I have looked again at the passage alluded to, which I am conscious was not irreverently written, and see nothing in it remarkable for its freedom, beyond the usual style of arguments *à priori*, on the sacred conduct of the Supreme Being. Perhaps I may not use the same words again in the same sense, (for I admit them to be unnecessarily strong) but I still think the proposition sound, and the import reverent. This, however, is *my own* opinion—for which no other person is accountable. Much is said about my making Moses a false prophet; but as it is not my wish to falsify any character, living or dead, but to treat all with due respect, so the consequence alleged would not follow any rational doubt of the correctness of a particular passage of the first five books of the Old Testament, because they are supposed to have been originally written by Moses. And before our author can fix on me, or on any one else, the fact of so making Moses a false prophet, he must be able, under the difficulties which R. Barclay has so strongly stated, to prove that the whole five books, *as they now stand arranged and rendered*, were certainly the work of Moses, and written under the divine spirit of prophecy. Our friend may be here again

dissatisfied with my presumption; but I rightfully adhere to the terms of my proposition; and till he perform the task, must consider myself as released from his inculpations.

But by such a kind or degree of doubting, we should bear, it seems, an "opposite testimony to "that of Jesus," and so prove ourselves to be *out of his school.* How so? Has Jesus vouched for the perfect authenticity and correctness, *as they now stand rendered,* of the first five books of the Old Testament, and of their having been so written and left by Moses? If we are to be unchristianized by assumption, we must come to close quarters in our vindication; and if the weapon of our friend's argument is again too short, his triumphant treatment, in the style of victory, must again go for nothing.

To refute my argument drawn from the uncertainty of reporters, against the infallible certainty of some things recorded about the *Jewish wars,* my opponent states, that where there is *Inspiration, distance from the source of certainty* is precluded; and that it is "nonsense" to suppose a revelation, without "conceiving a sufficient approximation of "divine intelligence, to give certainty." Now I hope to finish with my friend, without returning *on him* the word "nonsense;" but I must observe, after what has been said above, that this argument from *Inspiration,* though sound enough in itself, is only begging the question; the certainty of the full inspiration being the thing to be proved—and the thing too, which, whenever probability is against it, we have clearly a right to decline believing, till it be proved. This, again, clears incumbered ground, and brings us to new matter.

Under the head of the "Divine Goodness,"—a subject, I confess, of great weight with me,—my friend tells us, "It seems not becoming to call God "good, for what he does; but to call this or that good,

"because He wills it." This is a position that seems to be fetched more from the school of *Metaphysicks* than from scripture, or the school of Christ. However, I would not be unwilling, on that account, to join issue with him, if I could conceive him to be *right*, and strictly orthodox on his own principles. But there are several very striking examples, among many others, in the Old Testament, breathing much of real *inspiration*, which I think are of higher authority than our friend's metaphysicks. See the thanksgiving psalm of David, when he placed the ark at Jerusalem: "O give thanks to the Lord, for he is "*good*, and his mercy endureth for ever." In the dedication of the temple by Solomon, the congregation "lifted up their voices, with the trumpets, "and cymbals, and instruments of musick, and "praised the Lord, saying, For he is *good*, and his "mercy endureth for ever." Again; they "bowed "themselves with their faces to the ground upon "the pavement, and worshipped, and praised the "Lord, saying, For he is *good*, and his mercy en-"dureth for ever." And again, in Jeremiah, the language of a song, said to have been promised by God himself, for the people; "Praise the Lord of "Hosts; For the Lord is *good*, for his mercy en-"dureth for ever."

In numerous other places in the Psalms, and elsewhere, the *goodness* of God is a solemn theme of ejaculation and thanksgiving; and there is something so simply dignified and reverent in this ancient style of devotion, and so happily adapted to the feelings and consolation of all pious persons, through all ages, that I should think a speculative innovation no improvement.

But my friend still goes on, on the presumption of a settled design in me and my unknown associates, to *shake a confidence in the scripture authorities, to the injury of religion;* makes us pass the

"Rubicon," and would send us he knows not whither, beyond the regions of "Scepticism,"—till we land in "Deism." He also warns us of a metaphorick *declivity* below it, beyond the shining of the polar-star, or of any light! But we have no motive to go down this declivity, in quest of such gloom; for we prize the more elevated ground, where we can see the sun in his glory, and be warmed by his influence!

The simplicity of my principles respecting the essential nature of GOD, and a sufficient ground of union among men, for the social worship of the Almighty, and for the participation of religious delight before Him, is treated with much severity.—The *Goodness* and *Truth* of the Supreme Creator, notwithstanding the comprehensiveness of the terms, as used in scripture, are so far from affording a sufficient general ground for united adoration, that I am an *absurd Infidel* for my supposition. These ideas are magnified against me, as though I could have intended that all Societies should literally unite themselves into *one*, the world over, (and yet their distinctions remain) without any idea of regular economy in worship. Here, also, our friend introduces his favourite imputation of *Christ being excluded;* but yet brings many distinctions of *Christian* professors into the assembly, with Jews, and Turks, and other infidels: and Hannah Barnard, whom he seems always to have a pitiful pleasure in ridiculing, is brought in to be the minister of this general congregation.

A well-qualified, benevolent Christian minister,—supremely concerned for the improvement of human beings in real virtue, holiness, and reverence,—might be in a less favourable situation than in such an assembly; and provided all could *understand* the language of the speaker, some general good might be done. But, however this must be treated rather as

a matter of *possibility*, I confess the very idea of such a possible assembly, met on the simple principles before alluded to, excites in my mind more *pleasure* than *levity*; and if I smile, it is at the fruitful fancy of the writer.

I shall add, that though the various distinctions of persons he has named, and as many more as exist, may be happily accepted, if sincere, under their prejudices; yet the vast variety, arising from the multifarious weakness of human conceptions, respecting the supposed complex nature of the one unchangeable GOD, can be no subject of rational delight to contemplate upon—and especially when it is considered, that the multitude of distinctions have largely sprung out of the abuses of priests and designing men; who have presumptuously made that complex, which the real revealed will of GOD, so far as we certainly know of it, was sufficient to render simple! And the fewer and more simple the articles of faith, the more true devotion, harmony, and happiness, we may suppose there might long ago have been, and might still be, in the world.

Under these circumstances, it would be a good work for us all to endeavour to cultivate the revealed resemblance of the Supreme Being, as much as we can, in our own minds, and simplify the foundation of religious fellowship thereby. This disposition would be good and acceptable before our Maker; it would take away the *ground* of much of the controversy which is still subsisting among speculative and tenacious professors, of genealogical, historical Christianity: and to lessen the *quantity* of religious dispute, is far better than merely to *modify* it. It seems, also, a better *preparation* for peace, and for improving on the ideas of William Penn, in another state of being—where the *white raiment* is not (as our author would have it) to be anticipated as a mark of *distinction*, but as the *general clothing!*

5. On the long series of remarks in this division, chiefly confined to the subjects of the proper "Unity "of God,"—and of a "Vicarious Atonement,"—I shall not be likely to please my opponent better than before. Whatever he may expect to gain by his explanatory account of the *origin* of the "Sandy "Foundation shaken," it *was* written, and *was adopted*, and has been repeatedly *owned* by reprinting. It is unequivocally clear from the book, that W. Penn's ideas were directly opposed, not only to the popular doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Godhead, and consequently to the co-equality of the Son with the Father, but to much of what our writer would contend for; and that he rejected the notion of a *vicarious atonement*. And as I have remarked upon those points fully already, and may, without fear of refutation, refer to my former MS. I shall now have the less occasion to repeat and quote authorities. What our author would wish to establish by his continued complaints against "Scepticism" under this head, may be best known to himself; but it seems to me that our Society cannot be too cautious against ambiguous innovations on subjects of so abstruse and difficult a nature. There is no medium between the Son's distinct inferiority to the Father, which is repeatedly declared by himself in the New Testament, and much of that confusion and absurdity which avowed Trinitarians, and defenders of the Athanasian Creed, involve themselves in. There is no medium between the positive tenor of the Old, and the declaration of the New Testament, that "there is but one God," on the one hand—and, on the other, the admission of a *plurality* of Gods. Either the words *Father* and *Son* convey a *distinction*, and a priority of the Father as a cause, or they do not. If they do, the Father was first and superior, and the positive cause of the Son's existence. If they do not, there is no longer any distinction in

language, or the nature of things; the Son might then possibly be prior to the Father, and the cause of his existence! If the Father be the first and original cause of the Son's existence, the Son was *created;* and all that can possibly appertain to the character of the Son was created and derived also. If the Son have divine *powers,* as we reverently believe,—they are *given;* if he have divine *offices,* they are *assigned.* The Son, then, has no original independent powers; no original independent will. All his powers, will, offices, and activity, are of the creation, impartation, and appointment of the Father; and all the effects are ascribable only to the Father, as the first original fountain and spring. Therefore all the *influences* of the Son upon and respecting all beings below him (the whole intelligent creation beside) are influences substantially from the Father, through the Son. "My Father," said Jesus himself, "is greater than I." Again,—"The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of "myself: but the Father, he doeth the works."—Numerous passages of similar import might be quoted, as they often have been, sufficient to set this matter on an irrefragable foundation.

And consequently all moral changes, improvements, refinements, deliverance, and ultimate salvation, are the effects of the Supreme *uncreated will,* which being necessarily undiminished, uninterrupted, and everlasting, is the eternal cause of all other Divine causes and effects, through all creation, and in all eternity. These considerations, these incontrovertible principles, do not *preclude* the highest possible *intermediate* powers, offices, and works, of a created and appointed Being, as highly exalted above all other creatures, as infinite power, intelligence, goodness, and design, in the exercise of an infinitely gracious will, may have been pleased to ordain. Hence the highest *derived* Divine dig-

nity is rationally and devoutly to be ascribed to that character, whom, on account of his Supreme, created eminence, we are instructed to call *the Son of God.* This ordination of original, infinite power, admitted, —and the glorious effects of infinite good-will, in the creation of *the Son,* being, according to Revelation, believed in,—we believe in the Divine character of Jesus Christ, as the *appointed* glorious *Agent* of the Most High, for divine communication to man; the only *Mediator* between GOD and man—the holy anointed Head, Teacher, and Saviour of the world.*

These principles, I presume, are in pretty close agreement with the most considerable of our ancient Friends; as well as particularly so with those of William Penn, in his "Sandy Foundation shaken." The doctrines advanced in that book seem to have been written from the spontaneous conviction of an awakened judgment; a conviction which was not to take place in *his* mind alone. Our ancestors had their share, and we lay claim to ours. Those of "Innocence with her open face," though professedly explanatory of the former, certainly bear marks of a

* There seems to be much confusion involved in the terms made use of on these subjects by *J. G. Bevan,* in his pamphlet on the "History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends," said to have been written at the desire of the Meeting for Sufferings,—unless indeed his "Divinity of Christ" be such as would be compatible with the idea of "a Son," and with being *derived* from the supreme eternal Divinity of "the *one* "eternal GOD." He professes that the Society does not "attempt to explain those mysteries which remain under the "veil;"—but if they are really content, as he says they are, with "such terms as we find in the scripture," I hope he will be more cautious not to depart, in future, from this rule, and in its room put *more* "under the veil," than he has any clear authority for doing—thereby involving the Society in unnecessary difficulties. Whosoever does this must be an offender against divine propriety:—I will not mention the *penalty* against *additions.* At any rate, he gives trouble to the Christian church.

desire to conciliate some favour, and are comparatively laboured and obscure. But I mean not to reflect on our illustrious ancestor in what I have thus said, any more than in what is to follow.

The quotation from him, by my opponent, avowing the Society's belief in the passage, 1 John v. 7, of there being "*Three* that bear record in heaven, "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and "these three are one;" like the former notable citation on another occasion from Isaac Pennington, seems to be very unhappily brought forward for the credit of William Penn This passage, so much the strong hold of Trinitarians, and defenders of the Athanasian Creed, (but strongly suspected by many thinking independent Christians) having undergone of late years a very close investigation, has been shewn, to the satisfaction of biblical scholars and reasonable people, to have no apostolic authority, no antient Greek origin, but to have been spuriously foisted into a Latin copy, and under such circumstances as leave no rational doubt of its being a bold imposition on the credulity of the times.* I will not insinuate, against my opponent, that he is among the "folks" who *slur over what they can-*

* See the controversy on this subject, carried on by Archdeacon Travis, Porson, and others. In this controversy Porson proved himself an eminent Grecian, and equally eminent for his zeal in ascertaining the truth. After refuting the allegations of the Archdeacon, from one supposed authority to another—the final reference, I think, was made to the *Complutensian* Bible at Paris. But there, on investigation, the passage was not to be found! So that the question, among the most eminent scholars and candid men, seems to be put sufficiently to rest: and let it so remain. I have mentioned this recent investigation of the subject before us, as sufficient for the conviction of most candid persons in our own times; but I might also adduce many other eminent modern authorities, as *Whiston*, *Clarke*, *Emlyn*, *Sir Isaac Newton*, *Haynes*, *Bently*, *Blackburne*, and even the famous Trinitarian champion, *Dr. Waterland*.

not answer: he may possibly have been as much unacquainted with this matter, as I was with *his* author *Christicola*, concerning whom, or whose writing, I yet knew nothing. Had our friend William Penn lived at this time, he would scarcely have ventured to pledge the Society of his Friends to a belief of "the glorious Three that bear record in "heaven;" or perhaps to the personal attributes of Jesus Christ in the terms of "infinity" which follow.

I may here be allowed to make a short stand—and infer from the instance I have adduced, in addition to various difficulties which the most serious of scripture readers must be sensible of, that it is too much to assert and maintain, that *every* passage of the sacred volume, as it now stands, is to be received as positively revealed truth, under any thing like a *penalty* in religious fellowship. We should be thankful for the abundant quantity of spiritual instruction found in the best of all writings—and particularly so, for that abundance which is evidently inspired; but while we agree that "all scripture "given by inspiration of God is profitable," &c. let us not lessen our advantages by asserting and requiring too much for proof or credibility.

I will not enlarge on this subject further than to say, that William Penn was a wise and good man, but uninformed of the state of this subject; and doubtless, however much against his wishes, was betrayed, by desire of orthodoxy, into error. He "little thought that he himself should be quoted in "another age," not "to assist in the degradation "of the character of the Messiah," (for which purpose he certainly has *not* been quoted by me) but to assist in propagating the sanctity of an unwarrantable imposition on deluded Christians, and on the common reason of mankind.

The few remaining remarks of our author under this head are too trivial to dwell on. But I shall

conclude mine, by giving a few references which may be used at the reader's leisure, and which may serve to shew that the most considerable writers among our ancient Friends, were more generally agreed in the doctrine of the simple unity of GOD, than my opponent is aware of, or seems willing to allow: not that I think this one of the *first* of considerations; for though it is right to shew the truth of a collateral position which one has laid down, the question should not be so much in the stile of *who has believed?* as, *what is the truth?**

* Penn's Christian Quaker, in the first volume of his works, edit. 1726, page 541, chap. vi. and chap. vii.; p. 574, and 575, chap. xvii.: p. 572, chap. xxiii.

Barclay's first proposition in his Apology, compared with sec. 7, in his fifth and sixth propositions; and sect. 13, in the same proposition: and in the 23d sect. of the same, p. 170 and 171, octavo edition, 1736, where he quotes and gives his comment on the following text: "But all things are naked "and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to "do," &c. Proposition 13, section ii. p. 446, 447-8.

Fox's Journal, folio edit. 1765, p. 37, 152, 254, 434, 484, 568, and 608.

Isaac Pennington's Works, quarto, 1761, vol. i. p. 264, 265, 266, 413, 414, 694, 705, 712; vol. ii. p. 8, 16, 17, 104, 143, 155, 517. A careful consideration of the above passages may prove, undeniably, that our first Friends were real Unitarians; and also shew, as clearly as the fanatical genius of the age in which they lived will permit, in what a figurative (or inferior) sense only, they attributed divinity to Jesus Christ. Their sentiments more at large on the scriptures, as to their being free from errors, &c. may be found in the following passages.

Barclay's whole 3d proposition.

Penn's general Rule of Faith and Practice, vol. i. p. 594, &c. Address to Protestants, vol. i. p. 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, &c.

Pennington's Works, vol. i. p. 184, 239, 267, 268, 289, 355; vol. ii. p. 148, 331, 349, 446.

Some of these latter references shew what just ideas some of our early writers had of the primitive simplicity of the essential doctrines of Christian faith.

6. We come now to my opponent's continued and augmented imputation of *infidelity*, under the head of *miracles*. And here we find as much of that imputation as could be expected even from him; but the perversion of the tendency of my remarks is so obvious, that my replies to him will be easy, and I trust sufficient to shew that he is not warranted in the strain of his censure. He begins with applying a new phrase, "free-thinking," to my reasoning. To this phrase, if taken literally, without the odium commonly intended by it, I should have no objection. For without "free-thinking," on the most important topics of human contemplation, men would be commonly liable to misconception and error. It has been from "free-thinking," and the rational exercise of the powers of the mind, that numerous errors have been detected, and the most important truths have been ascertained and confirmed, both in religious and civil affairs.

It was "free-thinking" which reformed abuses of many churches in different ages; to which we are indebted for publick services under the head of the *Reformation;* and by which our own forefathers became distinguished as eminent *reformers*. The terms in themselves are laudable, and highly useful. Improper imputations require another description.

In one word of our author seems but too plainly conveyed a certain intolerance of disposition, which I own gives me no impression in his favour. He says of me "he doth not *dare* to impute imposture "to the scripture miracles." From such an expression I am led to fear, that if he had power equal to his zeal, and I were known to him, I should be in some danger of feeling pretty strong proof of his resentment, for what I *have* written previously to this Rejoinder. But I shall tell him plainly, that if I had no motives to remain unknown to him, I should not be found a person fearful of his discipline; for I

certainly do *dare*, and have always *dared*, to do any thing within my power, which has appeared to me proper to be done. However, as *the denial of the scripture miracles* happens not to be what I think right in itself, I do not dare, for that very reason, to deny them. In other words, I have no motive so to do.

The main object of my reasoning under the head of *miracles* was to shew that the belief of miracles, generally, was one of the most difficult acts and attainments of particular minds. This I endeavoured to do in such terms as might be at once clear, and capable of general admission: and thence to deduce the moral fitness of not laying such a stress on the *uniform* profession of belief in *all* ancient miracles, reputed sacred, as to make it a test of brotherly union among religious bodies.* This doctrine I sincerely thought, and I think still, is sound, and worthy the adoption of *all* churches, with respect to *all* its members. It is not denied, that my remarks were collaterally intended to apply to the case of Hannah Barnard, should the rumour be true, that she had expressed doubts relative to the correctness of *some accounts* of scripture miracles. But so far as I have learned since, it was not *necessary* so to apply those remarks; for that she neither denies *the scripture miracles*, nor has really expressed any such senti-

* It was rather natural that on this subject I should allude to the numerous and abominable impositions on the world at large, in different ages, under the head of miracles. From our author's stile and manner, I have no doubt of his being sufficiently read in these things to render particular references unnecessary. And perhaps on further reflection, he will find less difficulty in believing that, though such infamous proceeding invalidate not the reality and design of the recorded *Christian* miracles, they have a tendency to weaken in some degree the reverence of many good minds for authenticated accounts under the *general* head of miracles; and that such influence *actually is felt*.

ments of *doubt*, as should have given serious *offence* to any part of the Society.

I am clearly opinion, that the principle of toleration which I contended for, would not be unfavourable to the best interests of the Christian religion. It would not follow that a belief in the miracles recorded in the New Testament would be ever the more generally endangered, or the sanctions of virtue, and a strictly religious life, thereby weakened. For after all shall have been said that can be said, no man can believe without conviction from some cause or causes; and conviction of the mind comes not by compulsion, or the exercise of a dictatorial human authority in any matter whatever. It is stated that my reasoning is *deleterious*, and of a *rank odour*, although the *pill is neatly gilded*. I profess not to be a lover of *rank* articles of any kind; to the onions and garlic of a spiritual Egypt, I would not have any led back. I have not studied the compounding of deleterious draughts; and am neither a maker nor a gilder of pills. But, in as much as the sound health of the soul, as well as of the body, depends largely on the nourishment of *plain*, *simple*, and *digestible* food, I would gladly contribute to prevent all injurious *cramming*—all imprudent cloying of the appetite, with any unwholesome articles, by which the faculty of *distinction* has been too often spoiled.

One grand offence against truth seems, in the opinion of my censor, to have been committed in my position thus worded: "That no miracle, how-"ever divinely real, can be in itself any positive "proof of any other fact or principle—which are "matters *different* from such miracle." In opposition to this, our author quotes the words of Christ to the disciples of John, which refer him to miracles which Jesus had wrought; but for what purpose? Not as proofs of the divinity, or obligation of

any particular religious principle or practical duty of religion, which are eternally right and true in their own nature, and stand on the basis of that fitness, which existed priorly to any *command* concerning them; but as strong *presumptive* evidence (and more was not to be given) that he was the Divine Character about whom John enquired. Now that he *was* that promised and sacred character, and all his doctrines and precepts correspondent with it, have been made no matters of doubt in any part of the foregoing or of these strictures; but clearly the contrary, I humbly trust, has been devoutly implied and maintained. That Jesus on several other occasions as quoted by our author, referred with full propriety, to his miracles as evidences of his Divine power, I have not contravened, directly or indirectly; neither will any one who feels and thinks with me, ever think of so doing. Our author must, therefore, seek elsewhere for those "infidels" who *deny the scripture miracles.*

If he cannot agree with me in my sentiments under this or any other head, I have no reflection to cast upon him; but let him not first inculpate me in charges of "infidelity" of his own devising; and then transfer the odium, from me as her apologist, to an injured and worthy woman. My conscience is not amenable at this bar: while it acquits me, I am so far clear; and his inference I draw in favour of any other of my friends, who may be in a similar situation. It is wonderful how much direct and indirect censure of individuals, about religious principles, frequently takes place from *misstatement of facts, and surmises of what does not exist.* I have seen fresh cause for this remark, from having lately read a short extract of a letter, said to have been written by *William Savery*, from America, relative to Hannah Barnard, whom he by strong implication censures, as opposing "the doctrines

"laid down by Robert Barclay, and our first friends, "founded on the New Testament." Now nothing need be farther from the truth than is this general notion, as applied to her and those who think with her, as has been above shewn. From mistaken culpability to prediction of judgment is an easy transition! Hence a kind of prediction about her *withering* and being *confounded*. However *wrong* the current report and prejudice against an individual,—if blame be persisted in, and *public censure* carried, an effect will often be produced, to which the word *withering* may be applied by continued *presumption*, but which may have never the more reality: and as to being *confounded*,—while tranquillity and inward comfort remain, and sound argument appears unrefuted, to the satisfaction of intelligent bye-standers, the idea of being *confounded* will be only imaginary.

7. We come now, in order, to the concluding remarks of our friend; and the few observations I shall make, I wish may be the last I may see cause to make in this style of correspondence. He still keeps closely to his favourite ideas, that though I have been "cool," I have been "uniformly sceptical;" and my words, according to scripture description, are "smoother than oil." He will allow me, it seems, *soft words*, but not *hard arguments:* however, I am not without apprehension that the arguments have sometimes been too hard to be refuted, without the help of some *hard words* from him; and whether by their help a vanquishment has been made, the reader will judge for himself. In this last part he professes again to have discovered in me a notorious "inconsistency," because, though my avowed intention has been *to lay scripture waste*, I frequently recur to scripture authority for my support. If I could grant him his premises, which I certainly cannot, that my

intention, secret or avowed, was as he states, his conclusion of "inconsistency" might be just. But as his premises are wrong, the conclusion in which he has been embarrassed is easily accounted for. I have indeed often, and with much feeling, resorted to the valuable volume of instruction for my authority; and expect as long as I can read and think, that I shall have a peculiar pleasure in so doing—for though, as an Apostle once said, there are some *things hard to be understood*, there are many of most easy and delightful comprehension: and it was not "unwarily" that I applied the word "inspired" to the Apostles of Christ. I can apply it, with complete satisfaction, to many other characters and truths, which I hope he and I venerate in common. And what, if in this matter we shall charitably take in our Sister "*Hannah*," with her *one* name! She has been continually called on by our author, in that familiar or negligent stile; and though treated as an erring and unfaithful Sister, whose good qualities were not to be named in Israel,—I cannot help thinking that she *has* such qualities, which prudent and affectionate Brethren might have been instrumental in turning, and may yet happily turn, to some better account.

We certainly read in our bible the words "propitiation, atonement, and cleansing by the blood of Christ;" and in those consistent scriptural senses in which I conceive them to have been used, I not only receive them, but have always endeavoured to think on them, with rational reverence. I am also strongly persuaded, that in such senses they have been suitably received and prized by Hannah Barnard, and many other of our friends, who, perhaps, may not be quite satisfied with particular definitions of our author. But I would not uncharitably pre-judge his opinions; and if he have yet any which I might consider and adopt to my

profit, far be it from me to refuse to hear him. If we could thus come to be of one mind, though it might not be essential to our greater well-being in a state which is fast approaching, it might, with a view to present harmony, be the "nearest way "home." I love harmony in society far better than discord; and few men, I think, would take greater pleasure in seeing the little temporary intersections and impediments removed, which obstruct the possible benefits of a privileged and auspicious commonwealth. Such are to me pleasant ideas!

As these pages, from the nature of the occasion, may fall into the hands of many young friends, whose satisfaction, present and future, is an object of the warmest solicitude in my mind, I would here insert my salutation to them, in the feeling of unbounded good-will; and would declare my hope, that any inadvertent expressions of severity, which I have wished to guard against, may not be suffered to make an unprofitable impression on their minds. We are all beings of various imperfection, and liable to unintentional errors. But we have all one common duty of love, and the most favourable construction of each other's intentions, in discussions of this sort. No variety of opinions, no conviction of argumentative preference, no personal partialities, no disapprobation of sentiments, can dissolve that bond!

We, who thus agitate questions of particular faith, and of religious economy, shall soon be removed from the stage of discussion; but the important practical principles of virtue and happiness, present and eternal, about which we may cordially think alike, are of unfading beauty, and must endure for ever!

Whether, when *you* shall have arrived at full maturity of judgment, you shall be most of my opinion, or that of my opponent, relative to some

points which we have discussed—or shall be able to possess full satisfaction as to sundry *other* matters in the sacred writings—remember this: Do not hope to find in any other books instructions equal to those in the clear, the solemn, the sublime and merciful, of holy writ. If you deem yourselves called to an *impartation* of any peculiar opinions, or believe you shall have most peace in so doing, do it with seriousness, but not from a contentious spirit. Should you have no such apprehensions of duty, it may be warrantable and safest for you to be silent: for in the present state of imperfection, we are not to expect full satisfaction on all possible points. On all occasions, a charitable construction of the peculiar opinions of *other* serious persons is a general duty—its observance may prevent much unnecessary trouble, and secure important peace: on the contrary, a censorious conduct must be attended with disorder, and various unhappy effects. In all your religious intercourse, as well as in moral and social concerns, observe the golden rule of Jesus:—Its principle, correctly understood, is perfect. Seek in all things to acquit yourselves by the test of virtue which God hath revealed, and placed within you. Be *sober, chaste, temperate.* These three words, duly studied, are of infinitely greater concern than mere opinions—or the colour and shape of bodily clothing, concerning which it is chiefly requisite that both sexes regard a decent usefulness, and avoid improper cost. In that calm and stedfast meekness, implied by "*looking unto Jesus,*" endeavour to possess your souls; walking at once in the love of the Brethren, and in the filial fear of God. Thus all the uncertainties and trials of time shall be borne as becometh Christians, whose journey, set before them, is towards a land of infallible certainty; where the righteous of all generations dwell, where union becomes complete, and the boundless harmony of *Alleluliah* reigns!

And now, my unknown *controversial* friend, whosoever *thou* art,—seeing we are about to separate, perhaps never more, in this way, to meet again, according to the good old usage of our ancestors, give me thy hand:—Two such Brethren, however differing on some of the points we have treated on, should not part with any, even latent, sensations of wrath or envy; for "wrath killeth the foolish man, "and envy slayeth the silly one."—Thou to thy vocations, and I to mine!—Farewell!

Fifth Month, 1*st*, 1801. AMICUS.

POSTSCRIPT.

While the latter part of the foregoing Piece, "Considerations Considered," was in the press, I was favoured, by means of a friend, with a copy of a new pamphlet, entitled, "An Examination of the "first part of a pamplet, called *an Appeal to the* "*Society of Friends*," by VINDEX. Under this new name I recognized my old correspodent and accuser, the author of "Considerations Considered." The chief tendency of this new piece is, to shew that the author of the "*Appeal*, &c." has misrepresented the principles of our antient Friends respecting *Unitarianism:* and that his quotations from W. Penn, R. Barclay, G. Fox, and J. Pennington, are partial and fallacious. *Vindex* also undertakes to shew, that *their* doctrines of Unitarianism were such as included the eternal unity of the Father, Son, and Spirit, in the godhead, in opposition to the doctrine of *three* distinct and separate persons, denominated by others the *Trinity:* and

that the divine unity, in the sense of our ancestors, was totally different from the modern doctrine of the *unity* of God, which goes to the exclusion of the Son and Spirit from the eternal divinity. At least this *appears* to be the main drift of the pamphlet. As it is not directly addressed to me, and as the author attacked, who is stiled a "Co-worker" of mine, is fully able to speak for himself, should he think it necessary, I may be spared the trouble of general animadversion. And I have the less disposition to undertake it, because some following parts of this volume may serve to shew, that whatever *Vindex* may have attempted to fix, as the faith of our forefathers, the doctrine of the *divine unity* is not so susceptible, as he professes to believe, (for himself and them) of the senses he has contended for. This seems to me to be more important towards the elucidation of truth, than even to *establish*, in any way, what some of our ancient Friends professed to believe. And yet I may well be allowed the liberty of remarking, that much of what *Vindex* has quoted to prove the faith of our ancient Friends, goes on their particular adoption of the *spurious* text, 1 John v. 7, as though it were *original*, *apostolical*, and *divine*. This is *one* way of proceeding; but how far forth it is a *wise* one, his readers will judge.

As *Vindex* has, in several places, condescended to notice me with rather less appearance of *incivility* than formerly, I would not be wanting in my acknowledgements; and indeed I think he is really improved in the article of *civility* since his late appearance in MS.—But as there is still some room left for improvement, and he is in the disposition, let us hope he will by degrees become even exemplary. He nibbles a little at my signature, *Amicus*, in his introduction, and calls it *odd*; for what reason I know not, unless he supposes I was not *a friend*

to any one, because not so to the spirit of his former productions. I can truly assure him, I am not personally his enemy; and that I think well of his abilities. He says, p. 2, that I have *fastened* on the passage in 1 John 5, 7; but that I seemed to have forgotten that there was *no dispute about texts*. Now I do not like, if they could be happily avoided, any disputes at all: but *Texts* are very important things; and if by fastening upon an unsound and spurious one, I have shewn that it may be fairly set aside, to *prevent* disputes; surely some service will have been rendered. And if the opinion of some good antient Friend should happen to be shaken by the removal, we must endeavour to be content; for whatever stands on a mistaken and unsound basis, must sooner or later give way.

In p. 27 I am again alluded to, respecting an expression of mine in the "Considerations," &c. viz. "the awful enthusiasm of a maniac!!!" The three notes of admiration seem to be affixed to supply the place of verbal censure, as formerly used;—for it is fair to suppose that by these notes "more "is meant than meets the ear." Now much of the odium which seems to be implied, might be removed, if the words formerly used in connexion, relative to the *effort* of Abraham to slay his only son, were taken in: and surely that effort *was* "one of "the most horrid *in itself* that can be conceived of," in the contemplation of any human mind! If the idea of the *divine command*, as stated in the text, be powerfully present, it may rise superior to that of the horror; but still the idea of the horror must remain, as to the act itself, and I must be allowed to doubt whether, in the contemplation, *Vindex* himself can get rid of it.

Difficult of *literal* acceptation as the passage alluded to must ever remain, in the view of some and of many minds, I desire to leave it; and left it must

be, to be read, considered, understood, and profited by, as the serious reader can. But I still maintain, that independent of the passage, it is happily possible to be a Christian.

Vindex, who loves a metaphor, describes himself, and some others, (whom I know not) thus: "In "fact we wore our cloaks, as we thought, loosely "and quietly in the sunshine, and it's well we did "not put them quite off; but now in the present "rough weather that has set in, it is well to wrap "them about us." He also deprecates the state of a large family, wherein the servants should employ their time in disputing about their master's dignity, instead of doing his business. But "few illustrative cases move upon all fours." Let us suppose, not only that the beginning of this dispute is with the *superior* rank of servants, or with such as have aspired to that distinction; and that they not only are very peremptory in their master's name, that none of the household, whatever be their authority, shall profess to believe of *their lord's dignity* otherwise than as *they* do,—and this under a penalty of being put into a dark chamber, or turned quite out of the house! Let us then remember, that the *lord of those servants* will in due time assuredly come, and call the *offenders* to account; and in what more probable language than this? "Who gave you authority over "your fellow-servants, to reproach and punish them "in my name? Have you proceeded according to "any command or known instruction from me? "Have I not solemnly said the very contrary of what "you have assumed on my behalf? Have I not "uniformly declared that I had *not* the dignity you "have contended for, to the utter disorder of the family? Have I not given testimony before all men, "that on earth I was the *sent* of my Father—came "from him, in his name to do his work—and return to him again? That my rank in heaven has

"never been revealed as included in the personal es-
"sence of my Father himself, but as only nearest his
"throne—on the right hand of the Majesty on high?
"The character of your lord you should have drawn,
"as your fellow-servants did, from the tenor of the
"revelation made; and not have assumed in *my*
"name, and for *my* supposed honour, things which
"are neither written nor true. If I receive for you
"pardon of my Father, be ever hereafter more
"humble, and more kind to your fellow-servants,
"and disturb ye no more the harmony of the house-
"hold." This may be as a *storm* and *sunshine* together—for the master is full of benignity. But such is the substance of that language, which may be expected at the coming of our Lord, when he shall think fit to appear. And then it will be found, how far the wrapping about with *cloaks* of error and speculation, or with any unnecessary appendages, will be useful, or becoming the free and simple establishment of the Master's house.

FINAL APPEAL

OF

HANNAH BARNARD.

AT length the sittings commenced of that important *Yearly Meeting*, the first of the 19th century, which was to distinguish itself in the annals of church discipline by a new kind of theological decision. The accused Stranger, who had firmly waited to make her Appeal to the collective body against what she deemed an intolerant spirit, having appealed in vain to the Quarterly Meeting, presented her complaint against her censors. She craved a discussion of the merits of her case, and such redress as she thought that case required, both in justice to herself and for the credit of the whole Society. The paper presented was as follows:—

To the Yearly Meeting of Friends, to be held in London the 20th of 5th Month, 1801.

"The Appeal of HANNAH BARNARD against the Judgment of the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, sheweth,

THAT the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders presented a complaint against me, to the Monthly Meeting of Devonshire-House, in the 8th month last, containing the following charges:

That "she promoted a disbelief of some parts of "the scriptures of the Old Testament, particularly "those which assert that the Almighty commanded "the Israelites to make war upon other nations: in

" which also she includes the command given to " *Abraham* to offer up his son *Isaac*. It further " appears, she is not one with Friends in her belief, " respecting various parts of the New Testament, " particularly relating to the *miraculous conception* " and *miracles of Christ.*"

Though I have no desire to flinch from a close scrutiny into the rational consistency of my sentiments on any of those subjects, I believe it my duty, for the sake of others, to complain of the inquisitorial manner in which I have been treated by the said meeting and its committee, in the course of the many examinations to which I have been subjected on this occasion, as a dangerous precedent, of which I am ready to give a particular account, if desired, to the Society, in this your collective capacity; and not only so, but I claim the privilege of doing it, as considering myself justly entitled thereto, unless otherwise released from the grievous bonds and censure of which I hereby complain to you.

The aforesaid Monthly Meeting appointed a committee to visit me, and enquire into the grounds of the said charges, who, after repeated opportunities, on the 14th of 10th month, made the following report thereon:—

" *To the Monthly Meeting of Devonshire-House.*

" We have had three conferences with Hannah " Barnard, and we read to her the minutes of the " meeting of Ministers and Elders.

" The case of *Abraham* alluded to therein, she " explained to our satisfaction.

" As to *war*, she expressed her belief, that in no " age of the world the great and merciful Creator " ever commissioned any nation, or person, to de- " stroy another: but that they were formerly, as at " present, only *permitted* so to do.

"With respect to the *miraculous* conception and "*miracles of Christ*, she informed us, that they "had not been revealed to her mind, and there-"fore she could not assert a positive belief in them; "but that she did not deny them; and she fully ad-"mitted the power of Providence to effect those or "any other miracles.

"She said, that she did not consider an accordance "in sentiment, as to historic facts, to be essential "to salvation. And she expressed her apprehen-"sion, that too much infallibility had been imputed "to the records of the Old and New Testament, "not only by other people, but also by Friends.

"She appeared to be closely united to the Society, "in a firm belief of the inward manifestation of the "Divine will. And we endeavoured to convince "her of the propriety of Friends' sentiments upon "those points, whereon she SEEMED not to agree "with them."

On which I remark, that this report contains the whole matter of accusation against me, so far as the same is in any way recognized, even by a Committee of a Meeting for Discipline, and to which I am therefore alone in any degree amenable, if the said report had been expressly confirmed by the Monthly Meeting; which, however, does not appear to have been the case, by any of their minutes that have come to my knowledge. Much less does the said Meeting adjudge any one of my sentiments, as stated in their Committee's report, to be in any degree censurable, or inconsistent with the general doctrines of the Society, as a ground or reason for the censure and restraint which they in their final minute of judgment laid upon me.

And I here remark, that my different construction of the sense or import of those passages in the Old Testament, relative to the subject of *war*, ought not in my judgment to be construed to amount to a *dis-*

belief, any more than the same liberty taken by Thomas Elwood and others respecting those passages, wherein it is expressly said, that "the Al-"mighty hardened the heart of Pharoah;" that is, said Thomas Ellwood, "he suffered it to be hard-"ened." Instances of a similar mode of expression in the scriptures, requiring a like construction, occur on many other occasions.

On the next charge relative to the case of Abraham, the aforesaid Committee having fully exonerated me, it is unnecessary to make any further observations.

With regard to what is inserted in the minute of accusation relating to the New Testament, it rather affirms, than questions, my belief in the miracles recorded therein; implying only that my belief on those points, appears not to be one with that of Friends; but in what or how far it differs therefrom, it affords no certainty whatever. And though the report of the Monthly Meeting's Committee, is rather more explicit, yet it does not charge me with calling those miracles in question as historic facts in any degree, but does me the justice to give me credit for fully admitting the power of Providence to effect those or any other miracles; yet that I did not consider a strict "accordance in sentiment "respecting historic facts to be essential to salvation."

And I ask, when or in what manner such an accordance has been asserted by the Society to be so essential, or been declared to be the measure and condition of Christian communion, as part of a specific creed, or articles of belief, to be subscribed by any one requesting to join the Society, or by any of its members, as a requisite qualification, previous to their being acknowledged as Gospel ministers, or otherwise active members therein?

And with regard to what they have stated, of my expressed apprehensions about too much infallibility

having been imputed to the records of the Old and New Testament by Friends, it needs a little explanation: which, though it did not strike me, when they delivered me the copy, yet I explained it before them to the quarterly meeting's committee, to which they made no objection. That I did not apply it to the Society at large, but to many individuals in it; which I feel myself fully justified in asserting. And also that Robert Barclay's proofs and assertions, that they ought not to be deemed infallible, are carried full as far in substance as my apprehensions or sentiments on the subject extend.

The next subject mentioned in the said report I should pass over in silence, but for the solemn impression on my mind of its extreme importance, and that it is my duty to hold it up as the professed principal foundation and corner-stone of the faith of the Society: as indeed it is of mine. And I cannot think it improper to call your attention to its importance, by repeating it here, as it stands in the report.

"She appeared to be closely united to the So-
"ciety, in the firm belief of the inward manifesta-
"tion of the Divine will."

And here I think it seasonable to insert a quotatation from a late publication, sanctioned by the Morning Meeting, after having been, as I am informed, previously read paragraph by paragraph, sometime in the year 1798. In which, after intimating the necessity of being very careful, not to attempt to increase needless articles of faith;

"Of which," (says their approved author)
"Paul, no doubt with Divine assistance and chari-
"table caution, gives an excellent example, speak-
"ing of the wonderful efficacy of faith in God, he
"saith—*but without faith it is impossible to please*
"*him, for he that cometh unto God must believe*
"*that he is a rewarder of them that diligently*
"*seek him.*"

"This is one Apostle's creed," says the writer, "which is sufficient, or it is not sufficient. If it be "sufficient, then many an honest, though unlearned "Christian" (observe Christian) "may agree to "it. If it be not sufficient, then who shall have the "privilege of making it perfect? Shall one man, "or many? If one, then who shall he be, and how "comes he to that pre-eminence? If many, whence "must they have their authority?" &c.

The Committee then proceed to inform the Monthly Meeting of their endeavours to convince me of the propriety of Friends' sentiments upon those points wherein I *seemed* not to agree with them.

Here the whole accusation centers, and is by the Committee itself so far from being reduced to the necessary clearness of a positive well-substantiated charge of my holding false or unsound doctrines, that it is only stated, that my sentiments on some points *seemed* not to agree with those of Friends; the importance, nature, or extent of which variation, they neither ascertain nor even hint at.

On the 4th of 11th month, 1800, the said Monthly Meeting made the following minute: "The case "of Hannah Barnard having been again under our "solid and deliberate consideration, this Meeting "approves of the recommendation of the Morning "Meeting of Ministers and Elders, and advises her "to return home."

Here is not one word of, or even allusion to, the report of their own Committee, whose careful and serious attention to the subject certainly appears to deserve more respect.

It contains no sentiments, far less any judgment, on any one of the charges; either how far they were proved to the satisfaction of the Meeting; or if proved, how far these *seeming* offences were any of them deemed dangerous or unsound.

On both which points, the Meeting should have expressed itself decisively; both in justice to the accused, and as Christian counsel and caution to others; all which motives should have prompted them to pronounce an explicit judgment.

Instead of which, they merely say, they approve not the charges, but the recommendation of the Morning Meeting to me, which was to desist from travelling, or speaking as a Minister of our Society, and only advises me to return home.

Against which judgment of the Monthly Meeting I appealed to the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, on the 30th of 12th month, 1800, which referred the same to a Committee of sixteen of its members, who brought in the following report thereon to an adjournment of the said Meeting on the 9th of the 1st Month, 1801.

"Present, all of the Committee.

"We, your Committee, to whom was referred "the Appeal against Devonshire-House Monthly "Meeting, having fully heard the appellant, Han-"nah Barnard, and also the Friends appointed by "Devonshire-House Monthly Meeting thereon; and "having deliberately considered the same, are of the "judgment, that the proceedings of the said Monthly "Meeting were regular, and that their advice was "proper."

Which report was signed by fourteen of the Committee, the other two being present refused to concur therein.

By this report it might appear, that after a full examination of the several matters contained in the original minute of accusation, the Committee did not consider any of them either proved to their satisfaction, or if proved, fit objects of direct censure and condemnation; which all unsound, false, and

dangerous doctrines are, whenever they are fully substantiated against any member of a religious society.

On the aforesaid report the Quarterly Meeting made the following minute of confirmation—

"*Which was twice read, and is agreed to.*"

I complain to you of the conduct of the Quarterly Meeting, for continuing the said implied censure and actual restraint, without sufficient cause, in my apprehension, to warrant them in such measures; for the foregoing and following reasons:

1*st*. That the said minute of the Quarterly Meeting neither acquits nor pronounces judgment on me respecting any of the subjects of accusation; either the one or the other of which must be, on every principle of common justice, due to every person accused of any offence whatever: and as a suffering individual I ask, shall the decision of a professed Christian Church fall short of the equity of public judicial proceedings?

2*dly*. That I am credibly informed the said Quarterly Meeting, although repeatedly called upon for the purpose by several of its members, as well as the express terms of my appeal, refused to suffer the minute of accusation to be at all read; and therefore, as a Quarterly Meeting, still remain entirely ignorant of any one of the said charges against me.

3*dly*. That such implicit confidence in any Committee on such a subject, and on such a naked report, is in any case indefensible. But the reception of the present report, containing no information whatever on which any rational ground of judgment could be founded, was in this case unusually and obviously improper,—the Meeting having, as aforesaid, refused to receive any information whatever relative to the nature of the subjects so intrusted to their investigation and judgment, or requiring any of the grounds on which their said judgment was founded, to be laid before them.

4thly. That the whole purport of the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings' minutes of judgment have none of the necessary connection whatever, with either the guilt or innocence of the party accused; but impose restraint, and then merely offer advice, without alleging any cause for the same.

Against which proceedings, as departing in effect from the wholesome and impartial rules of the discipline of the Society, and the immutable principles of justice, I object. And though I wish not to impute it to any wrong intention, yet I feel myself injured by such treatment, as a Stranger, whose inducement for coming among you was, I trust, Gospel good-will, and an apprehension of religious duty: at the same time duly authorised and recommended, agreeably to the rules of the Society, by certificates from the Monthly, Quarterly, and select Yearly Meetings, of which I am a member.

I therefore now enter my complaint, by way of Appeal to you, requesting you to examine the subject, and either discharge me from those bonds, with all the implied censure; or clearly to specify, and furnish me with such reasons as may fully inform those Meetings in America, which gave me my certificates, on what grounds you approve and continue the same.

HANNAH BARNARD.

London, 19*th of* 5*th Mo*. 1801.

ACCORDING to the usual order of the Society in matters of *Appeal*, a committee of twelve representatives was appointed, to whose consideration and report this Appeal was to be referred. No *general* irregularity was to be complained of in the mode of this appointment; but against a *particular* impropriety in the choice of *persons* an exception

was taken by the appellant. She had been formerly accused and proceeded against at the instigation of the select Meeting of Ministers and Elders, which, residing in and near London, is considered as a kind of standing representative committee of that class of members in the Society at large. And she, not without reason, complained that this final committee of appeal should rather have been chosen from among those representatives who were not of the select class, with whom the impeachment originated. The far greater part, if not the whole, of the twelve persons chosen, being of that class, she excepted against the choice on that ground, as involving the characters of accusers and judges in the same cause. This plea was over-ruled, as of no weight; and the appellant was obliged to accede to the appointment as it stood, or not be heard at all. She proceeded to appear before her judges. Six respondents had been appointed to conduct the accusations, who were also mostly, if not wholly, of the aforesaid class of brethren. From such an arrangement, whatever might be the appellant's capacity, or doctrinal merits, an acquittal, against a kind of common interest and habitual feeling, was not much to be expected!

It is, indeed, possible, that if this national committee had been *wholly* composed of superior men, as to wisdom and independent spirit, the cause of the appellant might have had a different issue. I do not undertake to say that such, in this case, was in no degree the fact. It is not the business of the historian to reason from appearances of character, so much as to detail facts: but some degree of *opinion* has been ever admitted, as the means of accounting for events. I cannot undertake, from personal knowledge, to give an account of the characters of *all* the parties in question; for they happen to be *mostly* unknown to me. But from the degree of

such personal knowledge which I do possess, I have no difficulty in saying, that the choice of men, as men, was in some degree unfavourable to the cause of the appellant, and to the credit of the Society, on such a subject. Few, if any, who know them, will deny that the committee included *some* persons extremely improper: each of those whom I happen to know, I really consider to be men as *unfit* for such an office as could well have been selected. One of them, whose moral character, for aught I know, stands unimpeached as a wealthy trader, his best friends must consider with much allowance, and that it would be absolute injustice to him and the Society to make him a judge of any difficult points in theology. Concerning another, whose character has ever been that of a narrow-minded, penurious formalist, almost to a *proverb*, I have the recent testimony of a most respectable Friend who thoroughly knows him, that he was so extremely ignorant on religious subjects, as very lately to have seriously asked him, "*What the doctrine of the Trinity meant?*" Of this person, whoever should enquire his general character among his neighbours, would be answered, in substance, that he is considered as a man either ridiculously trifling or mentally deranged. Of another, the printed "Appeal to the Society of Friends" states his own declaration, that *had he fully known the nature of his appointment, he would not have accepted it.*—What a picture is here!

That such persons should be appointed to an office wherein the best-informed judgment was requisite, both as to the rights of the individual accused and the credit of a Christian Society, is equally to be regretted and blamed. But what impressions of regret can be expected from a body which is tame enough to submit to receive and record a report brought in from such a committee, without allowing any ani-

madversion or questions relative to the forming of that report, in the large assembly to which it was made? An assembly to which it exclusively belonged to ratify the sentence, either *with* or *without* an understanding of what they ratified? And that this blind issue of the business did take place, I refer to the testimony of the *printed account* aforesaid.—Such may be called an *orderly* and *constitutional* issue, necessary to the most *expeditious* finishing of a difficult business; but the rectitude of the measure, under all the peculiar circumstances, must remain a subject not merely of doubt, but of lasting dissatisfaction.

On this report, chiefly founded on imputations of the *negation* of faith, rather than on positive *disbelief*, as will appear from a fair examination of the evidence before the reader; and that respecting a very few points, unconnected with practical christianity, I shall omit to comment at large: but I cannot well omit again to declare a belief, very far from being peculiar to me, that *interrogatories*, as to such points, conducted in the manner used towards this appellant, are unwise, unjust, and of mischievous tendency, in any religious community. The exercise of such interrogatories and censures is utterly against the right of private judgment in any one—and if persisted in, as warrantable, would furnish perpetual cause of contention: If publickly sanctioned in a single case, it might follow in numerous others; and we know well, from the confidential intercourse which many of us have with different persons of reflection among the *Friends*, as well as among other religious societies, that fuel for such fire is never likely to be wanting. For about even some of the very topics in question, many respectable Friends, if they chose frankly to declare their scruples, have always *privately* entertained similar sentiments, as well in publick as in private situations. Such, while

the human mind remains what it is, must of necessity be the case. And I lament, in proportion, that narrowness and bigotry of too many persons, which would make an offender against Christianity an offender against GOD himself, in almost every one who cannot think exactly with them, in some doubtful things which they have learned to deem essential to Christian faith and fellowship. Contracted and deluded souls! Much more nearly fitted than they are aware of (did power favour their qualifications) to germinate and do more real mischief in the Christian Family than it is possible for them, with such dispositions, to do *service* in any sense whatever! And I particularly address these observations to the re-consideration of the chief agents in the late *arbitrary*, *insidious*, and *unworthy* conduct towards Hannah Barnard. Such persons are like the bell-wethers of a flock, or as the lordly leaders of the forest; they may never be at a loss for such as will follow them, at all hazards, and run the lengths they may determine to lead them; and even the more steady and respectable characters are too often induced by bold example, and through fear of blame for negligence, to kindle into unnecessary zeal, and join in the current of popular authority—authority too often popular, in proportion as unfounded clamours are raised, and the pretended rights of dominion are really doubtful in themselves.

There is a notable passage, though inserted for a different purpose, in a book before alluded to, lately sanctioned by the Select Meeting of Friends, from the pen of Joseph Gurney Bevan. It respects the adoption, instead of the discarding, of members. In the place of its insertion, it has something of the appearance of theoretic soundness; but it is capable of different applications, and lies open to different comments. "Although for the preservation of the "testimonies given us to bear, and for the peace and

"good order of the Society, we deem it necessary "that those who are admitted into membership "with us, should be previously convinced of those "doctrines which we deem essential; yet we require "*no subscription to any articles*, either as a con-"dition of membership, or a qualification *for the* "*service of the church.*" p. 115.

Nothing can be more true, than that the Society of Friends *professes* to require no *literal* subscription to articles, as a condition of membership, or as a qualification for *service in the church*. Had this professed principle of Friends been duly regarded, the reason of not requiring, *in effect*, any subscription, would certainly have operated against an inquisitorial and coercive conduct in the case now before us. That conduct towards an individual who had been received into, and found largely useful in the *service of, the church*, might have been wisely avoided; and the church, without injury, might have retained more of its *professed* character for liberty of religious opinion, instead of further suffering, as it has done, in so important a part of that character. Again, "We prefer the judging of men by their "fruits." This also should have been better remembered—and the *fruits* exemplified in the life and ministry of the party accused should not have been forgotten.—Lastly, "depending on the aid of "Him, who by his prophet hath promised to be *a* "*spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment.*" Now Hannah Barnard has solemnly declared, that *her* religious sentiments were exactly the same near thirty years ago, when she was first received into the Society, as now. Was there no sound judgment in the *admission*, or during a lapse of near thirty years, (many of which were employed in the *service of the church)* till, through a chosen instrument or two, it was found in London? And did sound judgment in *them* proceed by insnaring questions with-

in, and by countenance given to various calumnies without, doors? Did sound judgment in them, or primarily in *him* who chiefly sat and swayed in judgment, consist in making the same board, the occupants of the same bench, both accusers and judges? This may, perhaps, be resolved into the appellant's favour, by calling such a process *a trial by her peers!* but let us hope it will remain a *peerless* trial, and never be followed as a precedent! Did sound judgment consist in absolutely refusing her the liberty of challenging any one of her jury? But let us come to a few further reflections on committees. In the days of the apostles, whose decorum we profess to emulate, *there arose a murmuring of the Grecians, because a few widows were neglected in the daily ministration.* The apostles decreed, on that occasion, thus: "Choose you out from among yourselves "seven men of honest report, *full of the Holy* "*Ghost and wisdom,* whom we may appoint over "this business." Indeed! Were such qualifications to be sought for in matters of outward charity, in the mere Christian service of *tables?* Yes! How much more then was it necessary in matters of *faith,* of *religious liberty* and of *condemnation?* But were *men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom* sought for on the late occasion? This will not be asserted!—Twelve men were chosen, wise or unwise, from the rotation of a district; some of them respectable for *honest report,* and far be it from me to detract from any *general worthiness* which they might mostly be deemed to possess; but some of them, I am firmly persuaded, were far indeed from being *full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom!*

Let us not seek to impute moral blame, in this particular business, even to the weakest. The situation was not suited to them, and they were to be pitied. But the state of the church itself is the more to be lamented, when decisions which involve so

much of her character are committed to such hands! The author of the *adopted book* above quoted was, perhaps, not dissatisfied with the choice—for he was opposed to them in the character of an *accuser!* Not, indeed, like Satan, "an accuser of the *bre-* "*thren,*" but a notable and most determined accuser of an already calumniated and *solitary woman!* He could not expect, according to the import of his book, that a spirit of judgment would be divinely *given* to *all* who sat in judgment on that occasion! But some of them were the fitter to be influenced by that spirit of judgment which he had cherished in himself; which, according to ample testimony concerning him, he continued to cherish; and by which he finally triumphed, as the champion of sectarian despotism!—We come now to the *report,* or *sentence,* which this committee of *twelve* brought into the national Yearly Meeting; it was conceived in these general terms:—

"*Yearly Meeting,* 1801.

"The report of the Committee on the appeal of Hannah Barnard against the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex having been read in the presence of the appellant and the respondents appointed on the part of the Quarterly Meeting; and the appellant having expressed dissatisfaction with the said report, this Meeting proceeded to read the appeal, and to hear what further the said Hannah Barnard was disposed to offer; and also to hear the respondents thereon. The appellant and respondents then withdrawing, this Meeting proceeded in further deliberation on the case, and is of the solid judgment that the said report ought to be confirmed; and this Meeting doth hereby accordingly confirm the same.

"The Clerk is directed to hand a copy of the above minute and of the report to the said H. Barnard.

"W. RAWES, Jun. *Clerk.*"

"*Report to the Yearly Meeting.*

"We, your Committee for hearing and judging of appeals, have received and deliberately considered the appeal of Hannah Barnard, of the State of New-York in North-America, against the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, for confirming the conclusion of Devonshire-House Monthly Meeting, which had united in the recommendation given to the said Hannah Barnard to desist from travelling and speaking as a minister, and advised her to return home; and this Committee having heard the said appellant, together with the respondents on behalf of the Quarterly Meeting, until both parties acknowledged that we have heard them fully and fairly, do report that it appears to us that the said Hannah Barnard does not unite with our Society in its belief of the Holy Scriptures, the truth of which in several important instances she does not acknowledge, particularly those parts of the Old Testament, which assert that the Almighty commanded the Israelites to make war upon other nations, and various parts of the New Testament relating to miracles and the miraculous conception of Christ.

"We are therefore unanimously of the judgment, that the said Quarterly Meeting is fully justified in confirming the judgment of the Monthly Meeting of Devonshire-House, and its advice to the said Hannah Barnard; and it further appears that the proceedings of the said Monthly and Quarterly Meetings have been regular and orderly.

"Committee-Room, Devonshire-House, 1st of 6th Month, 1801.

Richard Dearman	*John Bateman*
Henry Tuke	*George Jones*
John Pryor	*Samuel Rundell*
Robert Maddock	*John Fletcher*
Philip Debell Tuckett	*Joseph Storrs*
John Grant	*Francis Balkwill.*"

The reader will now judge from the ambiguous negative stile of the Committee, and from what has gone before in this extraordinary business, how far the appellant was necessarily an object of a Christian Society's censure: and especially when it is considered, that this censure was founded not on any sentiments publickly delivered by her as a Minister.—He will also judge how far those *imputed* to her as her private sentiments of some parts of the *New Testament*, (but which, if she held them at all as matters of private doubt, she never publickly proclaimed or privately sought to inculcate) were sufficient grounds of publick censure against any person of Christian morals and eminent piety!

To some persons, not of the Society of *Friends*, it may, indeed, appear less important, that *a woman* should be censured for unsoundness in any points of theology whatever, especially in the character of a Gospel Minister—for many there are who consider publick preaching by any female as a kind of *intrusion* into a province peculiarly proper for *men*. But it is a well-known principle with the *Friends*, that there is no solid ground in the Gospel for any such distinction; and *they* not only lay claim to a rightful and proper admission of Female Ministers among them, but maintain that many of their *sisters* are eminently gifted, ornamental, and useful in the publick character. To *them*, therefore, the laws of toleration, kindness and support, are equally binding with respect to both sexes; and a respectable Female Minister from a foreign land should have been particularly an object of their brotherly regard and tenderness.

It may be important, though not gratifying, to some readers beyond the limits of her own Society, to learn the sequel.—After an able and highly creditable vindication of her religious rights and conduct before her accusers, finding herself fully dis-

charged from any further service of that kind, she soon departed for her native country, being accompanied to the ship by several of her faithful London Friends. After a voyage of some difficulty, she safely arrived at New-York, where she met a cheerful affectionate welcome from her numerous acquaintance and family. But intemperate zeal against imputed heresy is the same in almost all countries; and bigots are every where of the same family. The documents of the London proceedings having been transmitted to such as were deemed proper persons in America, the business was made matter of record against her in her Monthly Meeting before her arrival—and soon after that arrival, and the passing over of some difficulties attending the allegations against her, she was condemned to silence, as a minister, as had been generally expected. She is stated to have received this decision with a firm and inflexible constancy, remaining persuaded that the number of those who privately think with her, as to the great eternal principles of religion and godliness, is increasing, and will increase, and that the peaceable kingdom of Christ shall grow, 'to the glory of God the Father.'

I shall now call the reader's attention to other subjects, which in my plan for the compilation of this volume, have presented themselves as proper for introduction. In using the word *proper*, I mean with respect to the present state of the Society of *Friends*, (the consistency of whose religious opinions I feel strongly desirous to guard and improve) and for the use of Christian professors at large. Under these views I comprehend several different topics, which have not yet been largely or at all treated on. The most prominent, and which lie nearest my heart to inculcate, is the great, important, and glorious doctrine of the proper *unity* of the Supreme Being—and of the scripture character of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But before I enter professedly on those great doctrines, I shall insert a short *compendium*, which I conscientiously drew up some time since, and which the serious reader will perceive forms no unimportant article in the contemplation of the *Divine nature.*

PLAIN ARGUMENTS,

FROM REASON AND SCRIPTURE,

AGAINST THE

Presumptuous Doctrine of Endless TORMENT.

By W. M.

First printed for Private Circulation in 1797.

It is not known to be true, that the doctrine denied in the following short summary of arguments is generally *held by the people called Quakers; and, indeed, it is fairly presumable, that many among them are incapable of believing it. But as the subject is of vast importance to be soundly apprehended, I have been induced to epitomize and circulate my faith under this title; and I give the tract a place* here, *hoping some effects may arise from it, to the peace of serious persons. I had written on the subject more at large in my* Miscellaneous Companions; *but for more copious and learned treatises, I now take the liberty of referring to the excellent works of* Sterry, Stonehouse, Ramsay, Petetpierre, Winchester, *and for much of corresponding doctrine, to some of the works of* William Law. *Should, however, this epitome of arguments, leading into the evidence of sacred scripture itself, prove satisfactory and consolatory to the seeking ingenuous mind, my desires will be so far accomplished.*

I. BECAUSE every thing proper for man to believe, respecting his Maker, must be founded in the manifest *fitness* of that thing—or on the general evidence of GOD's *providence*—or on *revelation.* Now, there is nothing in the nature of *endless torment* (so far as it can be comprehended) which can evince its *fitness*—nothing in the analogy of providence which can make it *credible*—nothing in

sacred scripture, consistently understood, to support it.

II. Because GOD created man both for present and eternal felicity—and "for the purpose of his "his own glory:" But that glory cannot consist with ordaining to endless misery any part of his offending creatures; for that would be a glory, not of an infinitely *good*, but an infinitely *evil*, being. And to ascribe malignity, or capability of enjoying the endless misery of any creature, to the all-perfect "GOD of the spirits of all flesh," would be to slander his sacred attributes, and blaspheme his adorable and most glorious nature!

III. Because the sacred scriptures say, "GOD is "*love*"—but say not that he is *hatred*, or *cruelty*, or *revenge*. The judge of quick and dead is a being of infinite *goodness*, as well as infinite *power*. As such he has the adequate motive and means to save all from endless torment, whom his *justice* condemns to punishment, "according to their works;" and where infinite goodness and infinite power unite, the effect must be correspondent and sure!

IV. Because, (however zeal, ignorance, craft, or presumption, may assert the contrary) no *finite* being, even the most sinful, can commit *infinite* sin, either against a finite creature, or the infinite Creator himself; and that Creator will not, cannot, punish, but according to the finite magnitude of any guilt—for "his mercy covers his judgment-seat to an hair's-"breath!" As the omniscient, all-righteous, most merciful judge, GOD, most assuredly, "*will do* "*right*." He will most awfully punish, according to *his own* righteousness. But to inflict *endless torment* as the proper punishment of *temporary transgression*, he will not do—for that would be to confound his own eternal law of proportion, and rule of *right*, by which he governs the world—and to employ infinite power to do infinite *wrong!*

V. Because "*mercy*" is declared to be "with "GOD, that he may be feared:" and, "thou shalt "*love* the Lord thy GOD with all thy heart, with "all thy soul, and with all thy strength." But if the Most High were a being who, without mercy, could punish with *endless torment*, he would cease to be the supreme object of *love*, and of all *loving obedience*; and, as the source of overwhelming *horror*, instead of reverential affection, he could not be the proper object of *fear*.

VI. Because, though the infinitely pure and holy GOD has enjoined *love*, *obedience*, *righteousness* and *holiness*, as the absolute duty of his accountable creatures, and without which no man can see him to his comfort; he has most righteously declared by his prophets, that though he is a GOD "punishing "iniquity, transgression, and sin,"—"he will not "cast off for ever"—but, "in the midst of judgment, "he remembers mercy;" and "according to the "multitude of his mercies, he will have compassion."

VII. Because GOD, infinitely *wise*, as well as merciful, cannot punish, in time or in eternity, but in and by the exercise of his *wisdom*: that wisdom must have for its object either *honour*, *pleasure*, or *benefit to himself*—or to the *creature punished*—or to some *other* being or beings: but *endless torment* can be neither honour, pleasure, nor benefit to *himself*; it could be not *either* to a *miserable being so punished*; and lastly, it could not be *either* to *any other being in the universe*,—except (which is a bare possibility) to the *devils* themselves: to them, it could only be a *malignant*, *diabolical* pleasure; but *so* to give pleasure to infernal spirits, at the infinite cost of the impotent, the moaning, and the miserable, cannot be the work of GOD!!—therefore *endless torment* cannot consistently be believed to exist. But the *righteous* punishment of sinners, both in time and in eternity, "according as their

"works have been," for the final purpose of purification, deliverance, thanksgiving, and praise,—may be productive of infinite honour, pleasure, and benefit, to the whole rational creation—sublimely exemplifies the doctrine of an infinite Saviour—and harmonizes with the adorable character of the universal Father!

VIII. Because, so far as torments, by some persons considered as *endless*, have been described as inflicted, or to be inflicted, by means of *brimstone*, or any other *material* substances, they have not been so described in connexion with qualities *properly eternal:* for those substances being finite and perishable, *must perish*, and their instrumentality *cease.* "The *smoke* of their torment," which is said to "ascend for ever and ever"—or, in other "words, from ages to ages,"—is a description liable to the same remark. *Smoke* being *material*, and consequently not properly *eternal*, conveys no idea of *endless burning*—for the difference is, as *finite* to *infinite* duration; in a finite sense it must be sufficiently terrible, to answer all the purposes of warning and of fear: for, if such a picture, which may be apprehended, will not influence, an incomprehensible notion of *infinitude* of burning, or of any other torment, cannot wisely be expected to do so! Infinite adorable wisdom knew infinitely better!

IX. Because, although in sundry scripture passages everlasting punishment and destruction are denounced against unrepenting sinners, the original words, rendered *eternal* and *everlasting* in our language, may not have been intended in an infinite sense: for the same original word, and words of synonymous import, are used to express a long duration only of hills, mountains, generations, prophets, dispensations, priesthoods, &c. which we know from their nature, and by divine authority, have ceased, and must pass away; and seeing that,

by the common construction of language, an infinite sense of such words is not necessary, it must be extreme presumption to contend uniformly for an infinite sense, in the face of much uncertainty, at least; but certainly at the expence of the wisdom, justice, and mercy of the Supreme Being!

X. Because, though the same original words, translated *eternal*, *everlasting*, and *for ever and ever*, are allowed to be used in an *infinite* sense, in connection with *life*, *love*, *righteousness*, *joy*, *Jehovah*, *&c.* they so stand, awfully and sublimely distinguished by the celestial and boundless nature of those subjects; and they must *necessarily* (in those connections *alone*) be received in the infinite sense, or the greatest confusion of doctrine would follow as the consequence. Therefore the doctrine of endless torments can have no *necessary* sanction, from the common application of the same words to *perishable* and *eternal* things.

XI. Because the Christian religion, to which we are called, is a religion of *universal love*, and of *cheerful*, not *terrified*, obedience to the commands of the Almighty; a religion holding out the benign and gracious terms of *universal salvation*. The sacred founder of that religion, who came into the world for the purpose of universal benefit, is said to have given himself "a ransom for ALL, to be "testified in due season;" and the season will doubtless arrive, when the *just*, and therefore *necessary*, severities of punishment for sin shall, through his mediation, have had their purifying and glorious effect; when *he shall deliver up his kingdom, completed, unto his father,—having put down all rule and authority under him, save that by which he was constituted, and to which alone he was not superior; when he shall have destroyed sin and death; and him who had the power of death, that is the devil;* when (according to the strongest of all

figures) even *death and hell itself shall have been cast into the lake of fire:*—and *there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor sighing.* Then will be accomplished, in the universal and eternal sense, that glorious change, which every spiritual believer hath a temporary taste of in this life,—*old things are passed away—all things are become new—and all things are of God!*

XII. Because, though the impious doctrine of never-ending torments, as a part of the decrees of an infinitely powerful and good Being, (who has also been represented as having *pre-ordained* those torments for the greater part of mankind) is too monstrous to be really believed by many persons of moderate reflection; it is a very *delusive* doctrine, they too often ridicuously contend, that though they may not privately believe it, in its full extent, or may hope there is some human error in it; yet that it is necessary to be *taught*, in order to awe the *common people, the vulgar and the vicious, from the commission of more and innumerable crimes.* Thus such persons would risque the "turning of "the truth of God into a lie:"—taking occasion, from a doubtful construction of a scripture expression, to indulge their own secret pride and arrogance, they do no less than assume the necessity of using "a cunningly-devised fable," by way of mending the divine government; and they contend for the power and expedience of a slanderous fiction, to supply the want of wisdom in the Creator of the universe!

XIII. Because it is demonstrable from common experience, that the dreadful doctrine *of endless torment*, denounced in all its terrors from innumerable pulpits, is ineffectual to restrain the vices of mankind, or make them rational and happy believers: and there is too much reason to fear that the grosser vices are extensively and mournfully

increased by the positive assertion of a doctrine, which confuses and confounds the faith of unlettered ignorance, and becomes the cause of much indignant revolting from religious concerns in early life among the more educated classes of society.

XIV. Because, whatever in religion is not known on the best authority to be *true*, should never be maintained as essential to common belief; but whatever, on the clear evidence both of reason and revelation, can be shewn to be *false*, should be opposed and discarded in reverence of the *truth* and the attributes of its glorious Author. And there can be no policy more absurd and criminal, than to attempt to substitute the most awful falshood, lest the sublimest truths of the Deity himself should not be sufficient for the promotion of his glory, and the general good of the human race.

XV. Because, although it may possibly be objected, that there is an appearance of inconsistency with the character of a God of infinite wisdom and goodness, in permitting so much moral evil, and consequent punishment, to forego his own determined ultimatum of happiness; it is certainly much *more* inconsistent with those infinite attributes, to believe the *contrary* side of the question—that is to say, That he voluntarily ordained the creation of myriads of intelligent beings, through a long succession of ages, beings capable of happiness through all eternity, (he himself being the sovereign arbiter of all the possibilities of things around them) and yet, that he should so order the whole of his moral government, that a vast majority of those beings shall finally miss the grand end of their creation; and rather than become purified through punishment, into a fitness to glorify him, be abandoned *without end*, to the extremity of torment, and perhaps the *blasphemy* of that Being whom they were created to adore! *Annihilation* may be no necessary part of

the divine conduct; the highest glory of the Deity may not be promoted by it: but it would be more consistent with his essential goodness to believe, that being "punished with everlasting *destruction* from "the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of "his power," means literally *endless death* or *extermination*, rather than the *endless torment*, of those who may not be redeemed to an *endless life?* We certainly cannot know, ignorant and impotent as we are, wherein *positively* consists the supremacy of God Almighty's wisdom and goodness; but we are far better able *negatively* to determine, wherein that supremacy *cannot* consist; that it is *impossible* it should admit the *infinite* exercise of burning excruciating tyranny, when his own glorious goodness has commanded, as the most amiable excellence of our *finite* nature, the utmost sympathy, tenderness, and forgiveness of injuries, towards one another!

To conclude these serious remarks (which are penned in faith and reverence) it is good for such beings as we are, to endeavour to believe, as we are instructed to *pray* "only with the heart and with "the understanding;" for the substance of nothing more is required of us, than "to do justly, love "mercy, and walk humbly with God." In this world of infirmity and wickedness, there have been and remain to be unnumbered systems of error and delusion; but whatever is manifestly doubtful, or inconsistent with the immutable perfections of the divine nature, can receive no truth from the discordant clamour of a thousand generations. As sober Christians, we have nothing to do with incomprehensible dogmas, uttered in the strength of prejudice or enthusiasm, tending to form opinions derogatory from the sacred and endearing character of our common Father and Benefactor—and which would diminish in his sanctuary the beauty of a

"reasonable service." No man can redeem his brother or himself, or secure any interest in the Christian redemption, by the *quantity* or *blind presumption* of his faith. No set of men can mend the affections of the world by any feigned or random terrors—or by any motives or means beyond the genuine Christian doctrines of *love*, *humility*, *reverence*, and *peace*, which proceed indubitably from the Lord Almighty—to whom, *alone*, are equally and completely known, the *duration* of that "death "and hell," which he hath appointed beyond the grave; and the "many mansions," of that glorious *Heaven*, which is the place of his eternal throne!

OF THE

DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

HAVING intimated, as the reader will have observed, in divers places, that I hold in a *qualified* sense only the *Divinity of Christ;* and yet, as I believe, in a sense conformable to Divine verity in the tenor of scripture, it seems not improper to examine and explain a little further on this important subject: And this I shall briefly do, not only with a view to remove hasty and wrong imputations from myself, and such as sincerely think with me, but also to shew the inconsistency of a contrary faith. The belief of our first Friends, under this head, if it could be clearly ascertained, might be very useful for many to know; although it would not follow from thence that such a rule had been discovered, as could be binding on the consciences of their descendants, without full and free examination. I own, however, that I should be much pleased with such a clear discovery. But so far as I have been able to prosecute the enquiry, it seems to me we are not warranted in believing that our forefathers ever held, or entertained, the doctrine of the *proper eternal divinity of the Son of God.*

Our honourable Friend and pious ancestor George Fox, and other notable primitive *preachers,* having, for reasons perhaps well known to themselves, said little definitively on this controverted subject, we cannot more properly turn our attention to any one of our ancients, on this topic, than to the truly great and doctrinal Robert Barclay: And that we may do

him, and the Society in its origin, the fullest justice, I think it right to quote in the first place his whole section, vol. i. page 288 of his works in 8vo. 1718.

Concerning the Divinity of Christ, and his Being from the beginning.

"In *the beginning* was the Word, and the Word "was with GOD, and *the Word was* GOD; and the "same was in the beginning with GOD: All "things were made by Him; and without Him "was not any thing made that was made.[a]—Whose "goings forth have been from of old, *from ever-* "*lasting*.[b]—For GOD created all by Jesus Christ;[c] "*who being in the form of* GOD, *thought it not* "*robbery to be equal with* GOD.[d]—And his name "is called Wonderful, Counsellor, *the mighty God,* "*the everlasting Father,* the Prince of Peace;[e]—who "is the image of the invisible GOD, the first-born "of every creature.[f]—The brightness of the Father's "glory, and the express image of his substance?[g]— "Who was clothed with a vesture dipt in blood, "and his name is called the Word of GOD.[h]—In "Him dwelleth all the *fullness of the God-head* "*bodily*:[i]—And in Him are hid all the treasures of "wisdom and knowledge."[k]

Now the better to examine the import of these vrious characters, and how far Robert Barclay can be considered as stating the *absolute supreme Divinity of Christ*, I have marked in *italics* those phrases, and I think those only, in which Christ is not clearly described as a *divine, created agent of the Father*, (by whom the Father operates) and of course in which he is not plainly described as *infe-*

[a] 1 John i. 1, 2, 3. [b] Mich. v. 2. [c] Eph. iii. 9. [d] Phil. ii. 6. [e] Isai. ix. 6. [f] Col. i. 5. [g] Heb. i. 3. [h] Rev. xix. 13. [i] Col. ii. 9. [k] Col. ii. 3.

rior to the Father. Let us take these marked characters in their order.

1. "*In the beginning.*" These words, though not declarative of personal dignity, may be thought by some to indicate the *co-eternal* existence of Christ with GOD. But this is by no means a necessary inference: for then it might follow that the material universe was so likewise; seeing in Gen. i. 1. the same phrase is used—"In *the beginning* GOD "created the heaven and the earth." As this latter can respect only the beginning of *time*, so it seems most congruous with what follows in *John*, as *that* respects the material creation likewise, to suppose a similar sense was intended by the Evangelist, or whoever penned the chapter: or that if the writer intended any thing different from the *Logos*, or Divine Wisdom of the Father, any personal origin of Jesus Christ, he only intended the origin of the *instrumental* character of Christ, respecting the material creation, inclusive of the formation of man: not that he intended an infinite, co-eternal existence of Christ, as GOD; or, as an essential *constituent person*, or *character*, in the *God-head*.

2. But, says an objector—what, then, are we to understand by these expressions, "*the Word was* "GOD?" Not, surely, in the indefinite, infinite sense, for that would be incompatible with the description which goes before, "and the Word was "*with* GOD," and also with that which follows in so remarkable a stile of explication, "the same "was in the beginning *with* GOD." These reiterated expressions seem intended to guard us *against* the sense for which our opponents would contend, if from the order of words one sense be more obvious and fairly deducible than another. The natural and obvious paraphrase, or even reading, seems to be this: "In the beginning was the Word, and the "Word was *with* GOD, and the Word was *of*, or

" *after the nature of*, GOD; the same that was be-
" fore said to be in the beginning *with* GOD: even
" before he created all things that were made." This seems also pretty evident from what further follows in the Evangelist, but which our friend R. Barclay, studying scripture brevity, has not quoted, viz. " All
" things were made by (or by means of) him, and
" without Him was not any thing made that was
" made. In Him was life, and the life was the light
" of men. And the light shineth in darkness, and
" the darkness comprehended it not." These expressions apply strongly to his creative *agency*; and if it be said, likewise, to the operations and divine invisible offices of his character, I with equal readiness allow the consequence. But I cannot, consistently with what I take to be the general tenor of scripture, allow that it was an *unimparted*, *unappointed*, *original* light and life; for, " he *was given*
" to be a light unto the Gentiles, and for GOD's *sal-*
" *vation* to the ends of the earth." And correspondent with this are *hundreds* of passages in the sacred scriptures.

3. " *From everlasting*." This expression, as applied to the *going forth* of the Word, seems clearly to be used in a *limited*, not in an *infinite* sense. And the proper paraphrase appears to be this—
" Whose goings forth have been from *of old*; from
" that original existence which is everlasting:" For the expression *going forth from* evidently pre-supposes a *superior* and *antecedent* dignity, from which it could go forth. This sense is in harmony with a vast multitude of passages to be found in the New Testament, which cannot bear the meaning of an *original*, *self-existent*, *infinite* dignity: and therefore I reverently contend for the *inferior* construction of the phrase in question.

4. " *Who being in the form of* GOD, *thought it*
" *not robbery to be equal with* GOD." This passage

has been urged as one of the strongest proofs of the *co-equality*, or *supreme original God-head* of the son. But the common translation, adopted by our respectable Friend, is one of the least-supported in this sense by the learned, of any of the difficult passages of this class. One translator renders it thus: "Who being in the form of GOD, did not covet "to appear as GOD."—WHIST.

Another, thus:

"Who being in the form of a GOD, did not take "upon Him to be equal to a GOD."—WHIT.

And instead of the word *form* meaning literally, or substantially, a *personal identical sameness* of being; the original text is allowed by the learned and serious to mean, more worthily, an internal spiritual *resemblance* or *manifestation* of the divine nature of GOD. This sense agrees with the characters elsewhere given of Christ:

"The *brightness of his* (the Father's) *glory*, and "the express *image of his person*."—Heb. i. 3.

"The *image* of the invisible GOD—the *first-*"*born of every creature*."—Col. i. 15.

The rendering, "*thought it not a robbery to be* "*equal with* GOD," (not to dwell here on the numerous passages in which Christ himself positively declares his own *inferiority*, and that *his Father is greater than he)* is confessedly erroneous:—It is allowed by the learned Grotius, Bishop Bull, Archbishop Tillotson, Dr. Samuel Clarke, and many other able modern writers, that the most correct and proper rendering is this very different one—*Did not covet to be (or did not appear reluctant to forego the prize of being) honoured as* GOD; or as *a God*:—This harmonizes with the subsequent description: "But made himself of no reputation, and took upon "him the form of a servant, and was made in the "likeness of men. And being found in fashion as "a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient

"unto death, even the death of the cross.—Phil. ii. 7 and 8.

The three following verses are also very remarkable in their tendency, not only to do away all such ideas of Christ's *equality* with the *Father*, but to shew a certain *new effect* which his *meritorious agency* produced with regard to his personal character:

"Wherefore GOD also hath *highly exalted him*, and *given him a name* which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow,* of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, *to the glory of* GOD *the Father*."—Ib. ix. 10, 11.

In addition to the modern authorities quoted above for such a sense of the passage in question, we might also quote the names of *Origen*, *Novatian*, *Clement*, *Justin*, and *Lactantius*. But I trust it will not be necessary here to enlarge further on the subject.

5. "*The mighty* GOD, *the everlasting Father*." One very common and important sense of the word GOD is *Governor*. In this sense it seems to have been prophetically used here, and the fact will appear the more clear to the candid reader, when he considers the words which go before in this remarkable prophecy—"the *government* shall be upon his shoulder;"—he shall be called the *mighty Governor*. This appellation is naturally placed in the gradation of the dignities of Christ, who was to come among men as a new and *wonderful* character, beyond all men humble, but profound in wisdom, and to be

* It may here be properly noted, that the Society of *Friends* formerly, and I hope still, do not take the term *bowing the knee* literally, as the Roman Catholics and some others do, who bow at the *sound of the name* of Jesus; but metaphorically, taking his *name* for his *power*, as the appointed *highly-exalted* head of the intelligent creation.

exalted in divine dignity. A *wonderful Counsellor*, for the proclamation of that divine wisdom which surpasses all the false wisdom of this world—a divine and mighty *Governor*.——But by no means is the phrase *the mighty God* necessary to be understood as descriptive of that *supreme*, *infinite*, *adorable* Being, by whose authoritative *appointment*, and in whose name, Jesus Christ was to come, and did come. Neither does the following strong expression, *the everlasting Father*, imply that sense—to which, indeed, the following character, *Prince of Peace*, would be inferior. And the subsequent words, which are emphatically descriptive of his dignities, in point of duration, and which seem intended to sum up and complete his *appointed* character, fully agree with these senses—" of the increase of his govern-" ment and peace there shall be no end"—all taken together, import the highest *derived* dignity in Christ, and *offices* of a transcendent and truly divine nature, which all serious Christians may devoutly and consistently believe in.——But, to put any other than an *inferior*, *official* sense of the words *everlosting Father* out of the question, they have been generally considered, by learned and pious expositors, as bearing such senses as these: *the second Adam*, or *new Spiritual Father of mankind*;—*the appointed Head of the new-covenant dispensation*;—*the Father of the world to come*; (which is the DOUAY translation)—*Father of the everlasting age*; LOUTH.—*The Father, and Head, and Author of an estate of the world, to be renewed in grace, spirit, and life, which shall be without end*, &c. DIODATI.

6. " *All the fullness of the God-head bodily*." This description, taken from the passages in the Colossians, is very clearly distinguishable from the sense of *supreme divinity* in Christ. By the in-dwelling in him of that *fullness* is commonly understood and

defined, the *imparted nature* of the Divine perfections of the Father;—an impartation of *a resemblance* of the nature of *all* his attributes. This *fullness* residing and reigning in Christ, he was described as the divine *resemblance* of the *God-head*, even bodily; or during his continuance in the body. For (as it is elsewhere appositely said) "*it pleased the* "*Father, that in him (Christ) should all fullness* "*(heavenly fullness) dwell.*"—Col. i. 19.

But it never could be intended literally to convey the meaning of an *equality* of the fullness of Christ with the infinitely glorious fullness of the *Father*. This is too much for necessary Christian Faith:—and if such a sense of the word *fullness* were once irreverently admitted in the passage in question, it might be made to follow from another passage, that it may be admitted into *human* experience also:—for the Apostle, exhorting the Ephesians, says thus: "And to know the love of Christ, "which passeth (human) knowledge; *that ye might* "*be filled with all the fullness of God.*"—Ephes. iii. 19, 20.

I will consider, then, the foregoing correction, respecting the words "*fullness of the God-head,*" as sufficient for the present occasion, although many and irrefutable arguments might be added.

7. Respecting "*all the treasures of wisdom and* "*knowledge,*" finally mentioned, the words in connection are, "To the acknowledgement of *the mys-* "*tery of God, and of the Father*, (or *of God the* "*Father) and of Christ*, in whom are hid all the "treasures of wisdom and knowledge." So that the text itself does not say, that in Christ *singly*, or *personally*, but *in God the Father and in Christ conjunctively* are so hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. But admitting, for argument's sake, that the sense could be restricted to Christ *singly*. Could such an office, of being made the sacred depo-

situm of such wisdom and knowledge, for the present or future benefit of men or angels, prove the great point in question, the co-equality of Christ, with the uncreated eternal Father? or, in other words, the proper divinity of Christ?—Certainly not.

Thus, having examined the Articles brought together by our eminent Friend, under the head of "*the divinity of Christ;*" it appears that although he has given the words of scripture selected according to his judgment without comment, he has given words of *critical* and *various* import: and that he could scarcely have intended by them to mark out, undeniably, *the supreme divinity* of Christ—could not have intended a divinity of Christ in that infinite sense, in which some persons in different societies (perhaps some few of late in our own) would wish to assert, and require assent to—the perfect co-eternity and co-equality of the Son with the Father, as an uncreated, self-originated, and eternal GOD! A doctrine this, which, while it can add nothing to virtue and holiness, or the motives to them, confounds the most solemn distinctions of the human mind, unharmonizes all written revelation, and creates insuperable difficulties in the Christian world. How far these strictures may in themselves, or in their tendency to promote further solemn enquiry, prove satisfactory to the most intelligent of our *Friends*, I must leave; fully persuaded as I am, that they are highly *seasonable*, and worthy of regard. For it seems to me, that the present state of the Society, with respect to doctrine, is much to be regretted, when a *Woman* shall appear to have its sanction, in publickly declaring, as was the case at the last Yearly Meeting in London, "*That* "*Christ is God*, and *there is not another*."

But, considering the important awful relationship in which man stands to ALMIGHTY GOD, the

source of all existence, obligation, and glory; and to Jesus Christ, the *Son* of God, the Teacher and Saviour of the world; it must be of high consequence to understand what the scriptures positively say, and plainly imply, of their respective characters.—For those scriptures call on men for *faith*, and they explain wherein it should consist. Let us then with a steady purpose examine for ourselves, and patiently pursue the enquiry, under the several heads of *Divine Character*, and real or supposed *Doctrine*.

Of GOD the FATHER.

I. THOSE passages in the New Testament wherein He is stiled the *One* or *only* God. They are in number about *seventeen*, as follow:

Mat. xix. 17.—Mark xii. 19; xii. 32.—John v. 44. Rom. iii. 30; xvi. 27.—1 Cor. viii. 4, 6.—Gal. iii. 20.—Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6.—1 Tim i. 17; ii. 5; vi. 14, 15, 16.—James ii. 19.—Jude 4, 25.—Rev. xv 3, 4.

II. Passages wherein He is stiled God absolutely, by way of eminence and supremacy. They are in number very extensive; but the chief may be reckoned about *three hundred and twenty*, as follow:

Mat. iii. 16; xvi. 16; xxvii. 46.—Mark i. 1, 24; ii. 7; iii. 35; xvi. 19.—Luke i. 32; ii. 40, 52; vi. 12; ix. 20; xxii. 69; xxiii. 35; xxiv. 19.—John i. 1, 2, 18, 29; iii. 16, 17, 34; iv. 23, 24; v. 18, 44, 45; vi. 27, 29, 32, 33, 45, 46; vii. 17; viii. 40, 42, 54; xiii. 3, 31, 32; xiv. 1, 2; xvi. 27, 28, 30; xx. 17.—Acts ii. 17, 22, 24, 32, 33, 36; iii. 15, 26; iv. 10, 24,

30; v. 3, 4, 30, 31, 32; vii. 35, 55, 56; viii. 12, 19, 20; x. 38, 40, 42; xi. 17; xiii. 23, 30, 33, 37; xvii. 30, 31; xx. 21, 24; xxvi. 18; xxviii. 23, 31.—Rom. i. 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 16; ii. 16; iii. 22, 24, 25, 26; v. 1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15; vi. 10, 11, 23; vii 4, 25; viii. 3, 14, 16, 17, 26, 33, 34, 39; x. 9; xv. 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17, 30.—1 Cor. i. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 24, 30; ii. 4, 5, 10, 11, 12; iii. 16, 23; iv. 1; vi. 11, 14, 19; vii. 17; ix. 21; xi. 3; xii. 3, 4, 5, 6; xv. 15, 24, 28, 57.—2 Cor. i. 1, 2, 3, 18, 19, 20, 21; ii. 14, 15, 17; iii. 4; iv. 4, 6; v. 5, 18, 19, 20, 21; vi. 4, 6, 7; ix. 13; x. 5; xi. 31; xii. 19; xiii. 4, 14.—Gal. i. 1, 3, 4, 15, 16; ii. 20, 21; iii. 17, 26; iv. 4, 6, 7, 8, 14.—Ephes. i. 1, 2, 3, 17; ii. 4, 5, 10, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22; iii. 9, 10, 11; iv. 4, 5, 6, 30, 32; v. 2, 5, 20; vi. 6, 17, 23.—Phil. i. 2, 8, 11; ii. 6 to 11; iii. 3, 9, 14; iv. 6, 7, 19, 20.—Col. i. 1, 2, 3, 27; ii. 2, 12; iii. 1, 3, 17; iv. 3.—1 Thes. i. 1, 3; ii. 14, 15; iii. 2, 11, 13; iv. 1, 8, 14, 16; v. 9, 18.—2 Thes. i. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12; ii. 13, 14, 16; iii. 5.—1 Tim. i. 1, 2; ii. 3, 5; v. 21; vi. 13.—2 Tim. i. 1, 2, 7, 8, 9; iv. 1.—Titus i. 1, 2, 3, 4; ii. 10, 11, 13; iii. 4, 6.—Philem. iii. 4, 5.—Heb. i. 1, 2, 6, 8, 9; ii. 3, 4, 9, 13, 17; iii. 2, 3, 4; v. 4, 5, 10; vii. 25; ix. 14, 24; x. 7, 12, 21; xii. 2, 22, 23, 24; xiii. 15.—James i. 1, 27; iii. 9.—1 Pet. i. 2, 3, 21; ii. 3, 4, 5; iii. 17, 18, 21, 22; iv. 11, 14; v. 10.—2 Pet. i. 1, 2, 21.—1 John i. 5, 7; iii. 16, 21, 22, 23; iv. 2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 15; v. 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11.—2 John iii. 9.—Jude 1, 20, 21.—Rev. i. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10; ii. 7; iii. 1, 2, 12, 14; iv. 5; v. 6, 9, 10; vii. 10, 14, 15, 17; xii. 10, 17; xiv. 4, 10, 12; xix. 9, 10, 13; xx. 4, 6; xxi. 23; xxii. 1, 3.

It might have been important and edifying to have given the passages at length; but as it would swell the volume, as the references are easy, and as it is hoped the *substance* is already strongly impressed on the minds of many readers, such insertion is omitted. And the omission may be the more proper, as the intended insertion at length of nearly as many passages, declarative of the *subordination* of the *Son*, may sufficiently, for this occasion, mark out the solemn eternal distinction that clearly exists.

"In all the foregoing passages the Father is stiled GOD absolutely, by way of eminence; the construction itself necessarily confining the word *God* to the person of the *Father* only. It is reasonable in all other places of the New Testament, to understand the word in the same sense; excepting the passages hereafter set down, wherein the person of the *Son* singly has the title of GOD given to him."——Dr. SAMUEL CLARKE.

"The Old and New Testaments always, in every place, suppose and acknowledge *One Supreme Being* and most high GOD, and but one. The passages are innumerable, and this truth is maintained by *all Christians*, of all ages and denominations; but very much obscured and perplexed by the *bold and unskilful notions*, as well as *subtle expositions and metaphysical distinctions*, of many eminent ancient and modern writers."—HOPTON HAYNES.

III. Passages wherein HE is stiled *God*, with peculiarly high titles and epithets or attributes; which, though most of them be not indeed absolutely incommunicable, yet in the New Testament are generally, if not always, by way of supreme eminence, ascribed to the person of the *Father* only. They are about *one hundred and five* in number, as follow:

Mat. xi. 25; xv. 31; xvi. 16; xix. 17; xxvi. 63, 64. —Mark v. 7; xiv. 61.—Luke i. 32, 35, 49, 76; vi. 35; viii. 28.—John i. 18; v. 37; vi. 46, 69.—Acts iii. 13; iv. 24, 30; v. 30; vii. 2, 46, 48; xiv. 15; xv. 8, 17; xvi. 17; xvii. 24; xxii. 14.—Rom. i. 23; iv. 17, 24; viii. 27; ix. 26, 29; xi. 36; xv. 33; xvi. 20, 25, 26, 27.—2 Cor. i. 9; iii. 3; vi. 16, 18; xiii. 11.—Ephes. i. 11; iii. 14, 15; iv. 6.—Phil. iv. 9.—Col. i. 15.—1 Thes. i. 9, 10; ii. 4; v. 23.—1 Tim. i. 11, 17; iii. 15; iv. 10; vi. 13, 15, 16, 17.—Titus ii. 13.—Heb. i. 3; iii. 12; vii. 1; viii. 1; ix. 14; x. 31; xi. 27; xii. 22; xiii. 20.—James v. 4.—1 Pet. i. 23.—2 Pet. i. 17; ii. 1.*—1 John ii. 2, 20; iv. 12; v. 20, 21.—

* This is the noted text, *denying the Lord that bought them;* so commonly urged in proof not only of the *divinity* of Christ, but of his absolute meritorious *purchase* of the human

Jude 4, 25. Rev. i. 4, 8; iv. 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11; v. 13, 14; vi. 10, 16; vii. 2, 10, 14, 15; x. 6; xi. 13, 16, 17; xiv. 7; xv. 3, 4, 7; xvi. 5, 7, 11, 14; xix. 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 17; xx. 11, 12; xxi. 5, 6, 7, 22; xxii. 6.

race; a tenet which may very properly be considered in this place in connexion with the following commentary:

"These words are generally, and indeed most obviously, (as they appear in English) understood of *Christ*; who (says Grotius by mistake) is sometimes called Δεσπότης in the New Testament. And then the sense would be, *Teaching the lawfulness of denying Christ in times of persecution*; or of *gratifying the lusts of the flesh*, (see ver. 10 and 13 of this chapter, and Jude 4, 7, 8, 12) notwithstanding their professing of Christianity. But the comment of Dr. Whitby upon this place is worth remarking. *Christ* (says he) *being never stiled* Δεσπότης *in the New Testament*; *and St. Jude* (*ver.* 4.) *distinguishing this* Δεσπότης, *or* Master, *from our Lord; it seems most reasonable to interpret this of* God the Father, *who is said to have* bought *the Jews*, Deut. xxxii. 6: Is he not thy Father who has *bought* thee? *And the Christians*, 1 Cor. vi. 20, Ye are *bought* with a price; therefore glorify *God* in your body and in your spirit, which are *God*'s. Thus far Dr. Whitby.—To which may be added, 1 Pet. i. 17, 18, *If ye call on the* Father—*ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things—but with the precious blood of Christ.*—Further; as *Christ* is no where in the New Testament stiled Δεσπότης, (but *God the Father* only, as Luke ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 21; Jude 4; and Rev. vi. 10;) so in other the most ancient writers, and particularly in Clemens's Epistle, (the nearest to the Apostolical stile) the word Δεσπότης and ὁ Δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων [*the Supreme Lord of all*] is with great care continually appropriated to *God the Father*. The hereticks, therefore, the Apostle here means, are the same that St. Jude speaks of in the parallel place, ver. 4 of his Epistle; *denying the Only Lord God*, [τὸν μόνον Δεσπότην Θεὸν] *and our Lord Jesus Christ*; and whom St. John also mentions, (1 John ii. 22, 23) *He is Antichrist, that denieth the* Father *and the* Son; *whosoever denieth the* Son, *the same hath not the* FATHER. To *deny the Son*, in St. John's language, is to *deny* that *Christ is* really *come in the flesh*; or to teach that *Jesus* and *Christ* are two persons, as did Cerinthus."

Dr. SAMUEL CLARKE.

IV. Passages wherein it is declared that all *prayers* and *praises* ought *primarily* to be offered to *Him*, and that every thing ought to be *ultimately* directed to *his* honour and glory. These are in number about *ninety*, as follow:

Mat. iv. 10; v. 16; vi. 6, 9; vii. 11; xviii. 19, 20. —Luke iv. 8; xi. 13.—John iv. 23; xii. 28; xiv 13, 14; xv. 8, 16; xvi. 23, 24, 26, 27.—Acts iv. 24, 30.—Rom. i. 8, 9; vii. 25; viii. 26, 27; xv. 6, 7, 30; xvi. 27.—1 Cor. i. 4; xv. 57.—2 Cor. i. 3, 20; ii. 14; ix. 13.—Gal. i. 5.—Ephes. i. 3, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16, 17; ii. 16, 18; iii. 12, 14, 16, 21; v. 19, 20; vi. 6.—Phil. i. 3, 4, 6, 11; ii. 11; iii. 3; iv. 6, 7, 20.—Col. i. 3, 12; iii. 16, 17; iv. 2, 3.—1 Thes. i. 1, 2; iii. 9, 10, 11.—2 Thes. i. 2, 3, 11, 12; ii. 13.—1 Tim. i. 17; ii. 1, 3, 5, 8; v. 5; vi. 14, 15, 16.—2 Tim. i. 2, 3.—Titus iii. 4, 5.—Heb. iv. 14, 16; vii. 25; x. 21, 22; xiii. 15.—1 Pet. i. 3, 17, 18, 19, 21; ii. 5; iii. 18; iv. 11; v. 10, 11.—1 John iii. 21, 22, 23; v. 14.—Jude 20, 25.—Rev. iv. 8, 9, 10, 11; v. 14; vii. 11, 12; xi. 16, 17; xiv. 6, 7; xv. iii. 4; xix. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10; xxii. 3, 4, 9.

The foregoing number of striking, correspondent, and positive passages, in confirmation of the doctrine at the head of this section, must, one would hope, be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable Christian. And surely any particular texts which may possibly be selected for a different import, must be considered as governed by such a series of testimony; and to be received in that secondary and *subordinate* sense which divine consistency absolutely requires.

Of the SON of GOD.

I. PASSAGES in the New Testament, wherein the *Son*, in certain senses, is stiled, or supposed to be stiled, GOD. These are in number about *twelve*, and may be reckoned as follow:

Mat. i. 23.—Luke i. 16, 17.—John i. 1; x. 33; xx. 28.—Acts xx. 28.—Rom. ix. 5.—1 Tim. iii. 16.—Titus ii. 13.—Heb. i. 8.—2 Pet. i. 1.—1 John iii. 16; v. 20, 21.

In most of the foregoing few passages, the true ascription of the title of *God* to Jesus Christ is either doubtful in itself, or inconsitent with the several connexions. This has been shewn at length, on each of the texts, by Dr. Clarke, and other valuable writers; and scriptural criticisms to the point will be found on several of those texts in different parts of this volume. At any rate they *cannot* stand as declarative of any thing like the *supreme Godhead* of Christ against the weight of the opposite evidence. And when we consider the different senses in which the term God is used in sacred and other writers, the difficulty of the passages, if such be supposed, must easily give way, and leave the mind of a *consistent* examiner of scripture proofs in a state of sufficient satisfaction.

II. Passages wherein it is declared that the world was made by (or through) him. These are in number about *eight*, and may be reckoned as follow:

John i. 3, 10.—1 Cor. viii. 6.—Ephes. iii. 9.—Col. i. 16, 17.—Heb. i. 2, 10, 11; iii. 3.

On these passages it may be sufficient to remark, that the *instrumentality* of the Son in the work of creation, in opposition to any idea of his being the original *efficient* cause, is fully declared. And however inadequate the *human* mind, or even superior Intelligences, may, and certainly must, be to the comprehension of the mysterious mode of the Divine operations; no faith in mysteries seems to be more clearly and positively called for, than that of the activity of the Son being wholly *subordinate* to the Eternal Father on this subject.

III. Passages wherein are contained the *other highest titles, perfections,* and *powers,* ascribed or ascribable to the *Son* in the New Testament; either positively, or by probable, or by doubtful, construction. These are in number about *one hundred and thirty-six,* as follow:

Mat. ix. 2, 4; xi. 27; xii. 6, 25; xviii. 20; xxviii. 18, 20.—Mark i. 1; ii. 5, 8; xvi. 20.—Luke vii. 39, 40; ix. 47; xxi. 15.—John i. 1, 2, 18, 29, 48; ii. 19,

24, 25; iii. 13, 31, 35; v. 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26; vi. 38, 40, 51, 54, 62, 64; viii. 19, 58; x. 14, 15, 18, 28, 29, 30, 33, 38; xii. 41, 45; xiii. 11; xiv. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20; xv. 23, 24; xvi. 15, 19, 30; xvii. 5, 10, 11, 21, 22, 23, 24; xxi. 17.—Acts i. 24; iii. 14, 15; vii. 30, 31, 32, 35, 38; viii. 33; x. 36; xviii. 10.—Rom. x. 12; xiv. 9, 10, 11, 12.—1 Cor. i. 7, 8, 24 ii. 8; iv. 5; v. 4, 5; xv. 27, 47.—2 Cor. xiv. 4.—Ephes. i. 10, 20, 21, 22, 23; iii. 14, 15; iv. 11, 15; v. 5.—Phil. ii. 5, 11; iii. 21; iv. 13.—Col. i. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29; ii. 3, 9, 10; iii. 1, 11, 13.—1 Tim. i. 16.—Heb. i. 2, 3; ii. 5, 8, 16; iii. 3, 6; iv. 12, 13; vii. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2; xiii. 8.—James ii. 1.—1 Pet. iii. 22.—Rev. i. 5, 11, 17, 18; ii. 8, 23; iii. 1, 7, 14, 21; v. 6; vi. 16; vii. 17; xi. 15; xiv. 4; xvii. 14; xix. 13, 16; xxi. 22, 23; xxii. 1, 3, 12, 13, 16.

I thought it right to set down under this head the foregoing texts, in order that all the supposed force of collateral and constructive evidence, may be before the reader. Many of these texts, indeed, will be found given at length, under a different head, and for a different purpose; for which, in consequence of their failure to establish here any proof of the supreme divinity or God-head of Christ, they more properly belong, i. e. to prove by certain positive words, in such texts, his *inferiority* and *subordination*.

If the list given be examined with care and fair attention, it will be generally found that their import is *short* of any clear and positive doctrine, as to the *supreme* divinity or *God-head* of Christ. It will appear, 1. That the titles ascribed do *not surpass* the character of the divinely-created and appointed *Son*, as variously described of and by *him*. 2. That where the sense is clear, as to his exercising divine powers, they do not exceed the description of such powers, as conferred on him by the Supreme Eternal Father; but harmonize with such derived authority. 3. That in sundry places the evidence is doubtful, whether the dignity of person or action contained in the narrative may not more properly be ascribed immediately to the Supreme Being, than to the Son. But whoever, after due reference and examina-

tion, is not satisfied that these texts are properly *characterized* as above, but that they or any of them import more positive and independent senses, had better compare them very closely with the list given at large, to prove the *subordinate* being and activity of the *Son* — Such comparison will be likely to satisfy him. But should it not prove so, I perhaps cannot render the enquirer more essential service, than by recommending the serious perusal of the writings at large of Dr. Samuel Clarke, Dr. Blackburn, Hopton Haynes, and Sir Isaac Newton, on these subjects. And let him not be afraid of conversing freely with such great and good men, who loved sound religion as set forth in their bibles, and who, though they are dead, yet speak. If, on the other hand, my reader shall have found enough in *this* book, to convince him that such critical researches are wearisome, and from his own reflections that much study of such points is not essential to his happiness; but that he can be *kind*, and *reverent*, and *pious*, and accepted of God without it; far be it from me to urge him. I would rather say, he may be right with regard to himself; but then let him be silent and diffident in proportion, and by no means join in the vulgar cry of *heresy*, *scepticism*, and *infidelity*, against those of whose faith he is not an adequate judge!

IV. Passages wherein are set forth the honour and reverence which are to be paid to the *Son*. These (but uniformly not implying supreme adoration) are in number about *seventy*, as follow:

Mat. xxviii. 19.—Luke xxiv. 51, 52.—John v. 22, 23. —Acts i. 24; ii. 21; vii. 59; ix. 14; xxi. xxii. 16.—Rom. i. 7; ix. 1; x. 11, 12, 13, 14; xvi. 20, 24 —1 Cor. i. 2, 3; x. 9; xvi. 23.—2 Cor. i. 2; xii. 8; xix. 13, 14. —Gal. i. 3, 5; vi. 18.—Ephes. i. 2; v. 19; vi. 23.—Phil. i. 2; ii. 10, 11; xix. 24; iv. 23 —Col. i. 2; ii. 18, 19; iii. 16.—1 Thes. i. 1; iii. 11, 12; v. 27.—1 Thes. v. 28.—2 Thes. i. 2; ii. 16, 17; iii. 5, 16, 18.—1 Tim. i. 2, 12; ii. 7.—2 Tim. i. 2; ii. 22; iv. 17, 18, 22.—Tit. i. 4.—Philem. iii. 25.—Heb. i. 6; xiii. 21.—1 Pet. ii. 3, 4; iv. 11.—2 Pet. iii. 18.—2 John iii.—Rev. i 4, 5; v. 6; v. 8, 9, 10; xii. 13; vii. 10; xxii. 20, 21.

V. Passages wherein in the *Son* is declared, positively, and by the clearest implication, to be *subordinate* to the *Father*, deriving his being (in an incomprehensible manner) *from* Him; *receiving from* Him his divine *power*, *authority*, and other *attributes;* and acting in all things wholly according to the *will* of the *Father*.

These are in number upwards of *three hundred!* And as it may be useful to give so important a list in the most conspicuous manner, I am induced to distinguish this from the foregoing, by printing the passages at length. When the serious reader shall have read and considered them, (duly noting the *words* in *Italics)* we may well trust the event to the strength of evidence.

No.

1. Matt. viii. 21.—Not every one that saith unto *me* Lord, Lord; but he that doeth *the will of my Father* which is in heaven.
2. —— x. 4.—He that receiveth *me*, receiveth him that *sent me*.
3. —— ii. 25.—I thank thee, *O Father! Lord of heaven and earth*.
4. —— ib. 26.—Even so *Father*, for so it seemed *good in thy sight*.
5. —— ib. 27.—All things are *delivered* unto me of *my Father*.
6. —— xii. 50.—Whosoever shall do the will of *my Father* in heaven, the same is *my brother*.
7. —— xvi. 27.—The Son of man shall come *in the glory of his Father*.
8. —— xix. 17.—There is *none good*, but one, (Εἷς, *One person)* that is GOD.
9. —— xx. 23.—But to sit on my right hand and on my left, is *not mine* to give; but it shall be given to them for whom *it is prepared of my Father*.

No.

10. Matt. xxvi. 39.—O *my Father*, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, *not as I will*, but *as thou wilt.*

11. —— ib. 42.—O *my Father*, if this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it; *thy will be done.*

12. —— ib. 53.—Thinkest thou that I cannot now *pray to my Father*, and he shall presently *give me* more than twelve legions of angels.

13. —— xxvii. 46.—*My God, my God*, why hast thou *forsaken* me?

14. —— xxviii. 18.—All power is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth.

15. —— ib. 19.—Go ye *therefore*, baptizing in the name of the *Father*, and of *the Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost.*

16. Mark i. 1.—Jesus Christ, *the Son of God*, (and frequently elsewhere.)

17. —— ib. 11.—*My beloved Son*, in whom *I am well pleased.*

18. —— ix. 37.—Whosoever shall receive *me*, receiveth *not me*, but him that *sent* me.

19. —— xii. 36.—The Lord said to my Lord, *sit thou on my right hand*, until I *make* thine enemies thy footstool.

20. —— xiii. 32.—But of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but *the Father.*

21. Luke i. 32.—He shall be great, and shall be called *the Son of the Highest*. And the Lord God shall *give* unto him the throne of, &c.

22. —— ii. 49.—Wist ye not that I must be about *my Father's business?*

23. —— iv. 18.—He hath *sent* me to heal, &c.

24. —— ib. 43.—For therefore I am *sent*, &c.

25. —— x. 16.—He that despiseth me, despiseth him that *sent* me.

No.

26. Luke xxii. 29.—And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as *my Father hath appointed unto me.*
27. —— xxiii. 35.—If he be *Christ*, the *chosen of God.*
28. John i. 14.—The Word was *made flesh.*
29. —— iii. 16.—God *gave* his only *Son.**
30. —— ib. 17.—God *sent* his Son.
31. —— ib. 32.—And what he hath *seen* and *heard*, that he *testifieth.*
32. —— ib. 34.—He whom God hath *sent.*
33. —— ib. 35.—The Father loveth the Son, and hath *given* all things into his hand
34. —— iv. 34.—My meat is to do *the will* of him that *sent* me, and to finish *his work.*
35 —— v. 19.—The Son can do *nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do.
36. —— ib. 20.—For the Father loveth the Son, and *sheweth* him all things that himself doeth; and he *will shew* him *greater things* than these, that ye may marvel.
37. —— ib 21.—For as the *Father raiseth up* the dead, and *quickeneth* them; even so the Son quickeneth, whom *he* (the *Father) will.*
38. —— ib. 22.—For the Father judgeth no man, but hath *committed* all judgment to the Son.
39. —— ib. 23.—He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father, which hath *sent him.*
40. —— v. 26.—For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he *given* the Son to have life in himself.

* I use this simple, but sufficient phrase, on the authority of the learned and excellent *Coverdale*:—The word *begotten* before *Son*, used in our common and in several other versions, being inseparable from ideas of *irreverent grossness*, which it is high time to banish from a description of infinitely sacred operation!

No.

41. John v. 27.—And hath *given* him *authority* to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.

42. —— ib. 30.—I can *of my ownself donothing:* As I *hear*, I judge: and my judgment is just, because I seek *not my own will*, but *the will of the Father* which hath *sent* me.

43. —— ib. 31.—If I bear witness of *myself*, my witness is *not true*.

44. —— ib. 36.—The works which *the Father hath given me to finish*, the *same* works that I do bear witness of me that *the Father hath sent me*.

45. —— ib. 37.—And the Father himself, which *hath sent* me, hath borne *witness of me*.

46. —— ib. 43.—I am come *in my Father's name*, and ye receive me not: If another shall come *in his own name*, him will ye receive.

47. —— vi. 27.—For him hath God the Father *sealed*.

48. —— ib. 29.—That ye believe on *him*, whom he (God) hath *sent*.

49. —— ib. 37.—All that the Father *giveth* me, shall come to me.

50. —— ib. 38.—For I came down from heaven, *not* to do *mine own will*, but *the will of Him* that sent me.

51. —— ib. 39.—And this is the *Father's will* which hath *sent* me; that of all which he hath *given* me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up against the last day.

52. —— ib. 40.—And this is the *will of Him* that *sent* me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life. And I will (in virtue of such my *Father*'s will) raise him up at the last day.

No.

53. John vi. 44.—The Father which hath *sent* me.
54. —— ib. 57.—As the living Father hath *sent* me, and *I live by the Father*, &c.
55. —— vii. 16.—My doctrine is *not mine*, but *his that sent me*.
56. —— ib. 17.—If any man will do *his will*, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be *of God*, or whether I speak *of myself*.
57. —— ib. 18.—He that speaketh *of himself* seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh *his glory* that *sent* him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him.
58. —— ib. 28.—I am not come *of myself*, but *He* that *sent* me is true.
59. —— ib. 29.—I am *from Him*, and *He* hath *sent* me.
60. —— ib. 33.—And then I go unto Him that *sent* me.
61. —— viii. 16.—I and the Father that *sent* me.
62. —— ib. 26.—He that *sent* me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have *heard of Him*.
63. —— ib. 28.—I do *nothing of myself*; but as my Father *has taught* me, I speak these things.
64. —— ib. 29.—He that *sent* me is with me; the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that *please him*.
65. —— ib. 38.—I speak that which I have *seen with my Father*.
66. —— ib. 40.—The truth which I have *heard of God*.
67. —— ib. 42.—I proceeded forth and came *from God*: neither came I *of myself*, but he *sent* me.
68. —— ib. 49.—I *honour* my Father, and ye do dishonour me.
69. —— ib. 50.—And I seek *not mine own glory*; there is one that seeketh and judgeth.

No.

70. John viii. 54.—If I *honour myself*, my honour is *nothing*. It is *my Father* that *honoureth me*, of whom ye say that *He* is your GOD.

71. —— ib. 55.—I know him, and *keep his saying*.

72. —— ix. 4.—I must work the *works of Him* that *sent* me.

73. —— x. 17.—*Therefore* doth *my Father love me, because* I lay down my life, that I might take it again.

74. —— ib. 18.—No man taketh it *(my life)* from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have *power* to lay it down, and I have *power* to take it again: this *commandment* have I *received of my Father*.

75. —— ib. 25.—The works that I do *in my Father's name*, they bear witness of me.

76. —— ib. 29.—My Father which *gave* them me is *greater than all*.

77. —— ib. 32.—Many good works have I shewed you *from my Father*.

78. —— ib. 33, 34, 35, 36.—For a good work, we stone thee not but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, *makest thyself God*.—Jesus answered them: Is it not written in your law, I said, *ye are Gods?*—If he *called them Gods*, to whom the word of GOD came, (and the scripture cannot be broken)—Say ye of him, whom *the Father hath sanctified*, and *sent* into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said I am *the Son of God?*

79. —— ib. 37.—If I do not *the works of my Father*, believe me not.

80. —— xi. 22.—Whatsoever thou wilt *ask* of GOD, GOD will *give* it thee.

81. —— ib. 41.—And Jesus lift up his eyes and said, *Father I thank thee* that *thou hast heard me*.

No.

82. John xi. 42.—And I knew that thou *hearest* me always; but because of the people that stand by, I said it; that they may believe that thou hast *sent* me.

83. —— xii. 44.—He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that *sent* me.

84. —— ib. 49.—For I have *not spoken of myself*, but the Father which *sent* me. He *gave me a commandment*, what I should say, and what I should speak.

85. —— ib. 50.—And I know that *his commandment* is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak, therefore, even *as the Father said unto me*, so I speak.

86. —— xiii. 3.—Jesus knowing the Father had *given* all things into his hands, and that he was *come from* God, and *went to* God, &c.

87. —— ib. 31.—Now is the Son of man glorified, and God *is glorified in him*.

88. —— ib. 32.—If God *be glorified in him*, God shall also *glorify him* in himself, and shall *straitway glorify him*.

89. —— xiv. 10.—The words that I speak unto you, I speak *not of myself*: but *the Father* that dwelleth in me, *He doth the works*.

90. —— ib. 16.—And *I will pray the Father*, and *he shall give* you another comforter.

91. —— ib. 24.—The word which you hear, is *not mine*, but *the Father*'s which *sent me*.

92. —— ib. 28.—If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I said, I go unto the Father; for *my Father* is *greater* than *I*.

93. —— ib. 31.—As *the Father gave me commandment*, even so do I.

94. —— xv. 9.—As the *Father* hath *loved me*, so have I loved you; continue ye in my love.

No.

95. John xv. 10.—If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have *kept my Father's commandments.*

96. —— ib. 15.—All things that I have *heard of my Father*, I have made known unto you.

97. —— ib. 21.—They know not him that *sent* me.

98. —— xvi. 5.—Now I go my way to him that *sent* me.

99. —— ib. 32.—And yet I am not alone, because *the Father is with me.*

100. —— xvii. 1.—Father, the hour is come; *glorify thy Son*, that thy Son also may *glorify thee.*

101. —— ib. 2.—As thou hast *given* him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as *thou hast given* him.

102. —— ib. 3.—And this is life eternal, that they might know *thee the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom thou *hast sent.*

103. —— ib. 4.—I have *glorified thee* on earth; I have finished the work which thou *gavest me to do.*

104. —— ib. 5.—And now, O Father, *glorify thou me* with thine ownself, with the glory which I had *with thee* before the world was.

105. —— ib. 6 —I have manifested thy name unto the men which *thou gavest me* out of the world; thine they were, and *thou gavest* them me, and they have kept thy word.

106. —— ib. 7.—Now they have known, that all things whatsoever *thou hast given me* are *of thee.*

107. —— ib. 8.—For I have given unto them the words which *thou gavest me*, and they have received them, and have known surely that *I came out from thee*, and they have believed that *thou didst send me.*

No.

108. John xvi. 9.—I pray not for the world, but for them which *thou hast given me*, for they are thine.

109. —— ib 11.—Holy Father, keep, through thine own name, those whom *thou hast given me*.

110. —— ib. 12. Those that *thou gavest me*, I have kept.

111. —— ib. 14.—I have given them *thy word*.

112. —— ib. 18.—As *thou hast sent me* into the world, even so have I also sent them, &c.

113. —— ib. 21.—That the world may believe that *thou hast sent me*.

114. —— ib. 22.—And the *glory* which *thou gavest me*, I have given them.

115. —— ib. 23.—And that the world may know that *thou* hast *sent me*, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.

116. —— ib. 24.—Father, I will that they also whom *thou* hast *given me*, be with me where I am; that they may behold my *glory*, which *thou hast given me*; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.

117. —— ib. 25.—And these have known that *thou* hast *sent me*.

118. —— xviii. 11.—The cup which *my Father* hath *given me*, shall I not drink it?

119. —— xx. 17.—I ascend unto *my Father* and *your Father*, and to *my God* and *your God*.

120. —— ib. 21.—As my Father hath *sent* me, even so send I you.

121. Acts i. 7.—It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which *the Father* has put *in his own power*.

122. —— ii. 22.—Jesus, *a man approved of* GOD, among you by miracles, which GOD *did by him*.

No.

123. Acts ii. 24.—Whom GOD hath *raised up*.

124. —— ib. 32.—This Jesus hath GOD *raised up*.

125. —— ib. 33.—Being by the hand of GOD *exalted*, and having *received of the Father*, &c.

126. —— ib. 34.—The LORD (Jehovah) said unto my Lord, *sit thou on my right hand*.

127. —— ib. 35.—Until *I make* thy foes thy footstool.

128. —— ib. 36.—GOD *hath made* that same *Jesus* both *Lord and Christ*.

129. —— iii. 13.—The GOD of our fathers hath *glorified* his *Son* Jesus.

130. —— ib. 15.—The Prince of Life, [the leader unto life—the captain of salvation] whom GOD hath *raised from the dead*.

131. —— ib. 20.—And he shall *send* Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you.

132. —— ib. 26.—GOD having *raised up* his *Son* Jesus, *sent* him to bless you.

133. —— iv. 10.—Jesus Christ, whom GOD *raised from the dead*.

ib. 26.—Against the Lord, and against *his Christ*.

134. —— ib. 27.—For of a truth, against *thy holy child* Jesus, whom *thou hast anointed*.

135. —— ib. 30.—Stretching forth *thine hand to heal*, and that signs and wonders may be done *by the name of thy holy child* Jesus.

136. —— v. 30.—The GOD of our Fathers *raised up Jesus*.

137. —— ib. 31.—Him hath GOD *exalted* with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour.

138. —— x. 38.—GOD *anointed* Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and *wi. power*—for GOD was *with him*.

139. —— ib. 40.—Him GOD *raised* the third day, and *shewed him open*

No.

140. Acts xiii. 42.—It is he which was *ordained of* GOD, to be the Judge of quick and dead.

141. —— xiii. 23.—Of this *man*'s seed hath GOD according to his promise, *raised* unto Israel a Saviour, *Jesus*.

142. —— ib. 30 —But GOD *raised* him *from the dead.*

143. —— ib 33.—GOD hath fulfilled the same [promise]—in that he hath *raised up Jesus* again: As it is also written in the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son; this day have I created thee.*

144. —— ib. 34.—That he *raised* him *up from the dead.*

145. —— ib. 37.—But he whom GOD *raised again.*

146. —— ib. 47.—*I* have *set thee* to be a light unto the Gentiles, &c.

147. —— xvii. 31.—In that he [GOD] hath *raised him from the dead.*

148. Rom. i. 3.—Concerning *his Son*, which *was made* of the seed of David, &c.

149. —— ib. 4.—And *declared* to be the *Son of God* with *power*, according to the Spirit of Holiness, *by the resurrection from the dead.*

150. —— ii. 16 —GOD shall judge the secrets of men *by Jesus Christ.*

151. —— iii. 24.—Being justified freely by *his* [GOD's] grace, *through* the redemption that is *in* Christ Jesus.

152. —— ib. 25. Whom GOD hath *set forth* to to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his [GOD's] righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, *through the forbearance of God*

153. —— iv. 24.—Him that *raised up Jesus our Lord* from the dead.

No.

154. Rom. v. 8.—GOD commendeth *his love* towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, *Christ died for us.*

155. —— vi. 4.—As *Christ* was *raised* up from the dead, *by* the glory [power] *of the Father.*

156. —— viii. 3.—GOD *sending* his own *Son.*

157. —— ib. 11.—Him that *raised up Jesus* from the dead;—He that *raised up Christ* from the dead.

158. —— ib. 17.—Heirs of GOD, and *joint-heirs with Christ.*

159. —— ib. 32.—He that *spared not* his own Son, but *delivered him up* for us all; how shall he not *with him* also freely *give* us all things?

160. —— ib. 34.—Christ, who is even *at the right hand of* GOD, who also *maketh intercession for us.*

161. —— x. 9.—If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the *Lord Jesus*, and shalt believe in thine heart *that* GOD *hath raised him from the dead*, thou shalt be saved.

162. —— xv. 6.—GOD, even the *Father*, (or *the God and Father*) of our Lord Jesus Christ.

163. —— ib. 7.—As *Christ* also received us, *to the glory of* GOD.

164. —— ib. 8.—*Jesus Christ* was a *minister* of the circumcision for the truth *of* GOD.

165. —— 1 Cor. i. 30.—In *Christ Jesus*, who of GOD *is made unto us* wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.

166. —— iii. 23.—And *ye* are *Christ's*, and *Christ* is GOD.

167. —— vi. 14.—GOD hath both *raised up the Lord*, and will also raise up us, *by his own power.*

No.

168. Rom. xi. 3.—The head of every man is *Christ;* and the head of the woman is the man; and *the head of Christ* is GOD.

169. —— xv. 15.—We have testified of GOD, that *he raised up Christ,* whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.

170. —— ib. 24.—Then cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up* the kingdom to GOD, even *the Father.*

171. —— ib. 27.—For *He* hath *put* all things under his feet; but when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that HE is excepted, which *did put* all things under him.

172. —— ib. 28.—And when all things shall be subdued under him, then shall the *Son* also *himself be subject* unto *him that put* all things under him; that GOD *may be all in all.*

173. —— ib. 57.—Thanks be to GOD, which *giveth* us the victory, *through our Lord Jesus Christ.*

174. 2 Cor. i. 3.—Blessed be GOD, even the *Father* [or, *the God and Father*] of our Lord Jesus Christ.

175. —— ii. 14.—Thanks be unto GOD, which always *causeth* us to triumph *in Christ.*

176. —— iv. 4.—*Christ,* who is the *image* of GOD.

177. —— ib. 6.—GOD, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to *give* the light of the knowledge of the glory of GOD, in the *face* [or, *in the person*] of *Jesus Christ.*

178. —— ib. 14.—He which *raised up the Lord Jesus,* shall *raise up us* also *by Jesus.*

179. —— ib. 18.—And *all things are of* GOD, who hath reconciled us unto himself, by *Jesus Christ,* and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.

No.

180. 2 Cor. iv. 19.—To wit, that GOD was *in Christ,* (or *by*, or *by means of, Christ)* reconciling the world unto himself.

181. —— v. 20.—Now then we are ambassadors *for Christ (instead of Christ)* as though GOD did beseech you *by us;* we pray you *in Christ's stead,* be ye reconciled to GOD.

182. —— ib. 21.—For he hath *made him to be sin for us,* who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of GOD in *him.*

183. —— ix. 31.—The GOD *and Father* of our Lord *Jesus Christ.*

184. —— xiii. 4.—Though he *(Christ)* was crucified, yet he liveth *by the power of* GOD.

185. Gal. i. 1.—By *Jesus Christ,* and GOD the Father, *who raised him from the dead.*

186. —— ib. 4.—Who *(Christ)* gave himself for our sins, *according to the will of* GOD, *and our Father.*

187. —— iv. 4.—When the fullness of time was come, GOD *sent forth his Son.*

188. —— ib. 14.—As an *Angel* of GOD, [or, *messenger*] even as *Jesus Christ.*

189. Ephes. i. 3.—Blessed be *the* GOD *and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

190. —— ib. 5.—Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by *Jesus Christ* to himself, *according to the pleasure of his will.*

191. —— ib. 6.—To the praise of *the glory of his grace,* wherein *He* hath made us accepted *in the beloved.*

192. —— ib. 7.—In whom we have redemption *through his blood,* the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of *his (GOD's) grace.*

No.

193. Ephes. i. 9.—Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, *according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself.*

194. —— ib. 10.—That he might gather together in one all things *in* [or *by*] *Christ.*

195. —— ib. 11.—*In* whom [*Christ*] also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to *the purpose of Him* [God] *who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.*

196. —— ib. 17.—That *the* God *of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the *Father of Glory*, &c.

197. —— ib 19.—The *exceeding greatness* of *his* [God's] *power*—according to the working of *his mighty power.*

198. —— ib. 20.—Which he wrought in Christ, when *he raised him from the dead*, and *set him at his own right hand*, in the heavenly places.

199. —— ib. 22.—And hath *put* all things under his feet, and *gave* him to be the head over all things in the church.

200. —— ii. 5.—God hath quickened us, *together with Christ.*

201. —— ib. 6.—And hath raised us up *together*, [*with Christ*] and hath made us sit *together* in heavenly places *in Christ Jesus.*

202. —— ib. 7.—That in the ages to come, *He* might shew the exceeding riches of *his* grace, in *his kindness* towards us, *thro' Christ Jesus.*

203. —— ib. x.—For we are *his workmanship*, created *in Christ Jesus.*

204. —— ib. 16.—And that *he* might reconcile both *unto* God.

205. —— ib. 18.—*Through him* we both have an an access, *by one Spirit unto the Father.*

No.

206. Ephes. ii. 19.—Fellow citizens with the saints, and of the *houshold* of GOD.

207. —— ib. 20.—And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, *Jesus Christ himself* being the *chief corner-stone.*

208. —— iii. 6.—*His* promise *in Christ,* by the gospel.

209. —— ib. 9.—GOD, who *created* all things *by Jesus Christ.*

210. —— ib. 10, 11.—The manifold wisdom of GOD, according to the eternal purpose which *He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.*

211. —— iv. 4, 5, 6.—There is one *Spirit*—one *Lord*—one *God and Father of all,* who is *above all,* &c.

212. —— ib. 32.—Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as GOD, for *Christ's sake, hath forgiven you.*

213. —— v. 2.—As Christ also—hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to GOD, *for a sweet-smelling savour.*

214. Phil. ii. 6.—Who being in the form [or *likeness*] of GOD, *did not covet to be honoured as* GOD, &c.

215. —— ib. 7.—And *was made* in the likeness of men.

216. —— ib. 8.—And became *obedient* unto death.

217. —— ib. 9.—Wherefore GOD hath *highly exalted* him, and *given him* a name which is above every name.

218. —— ib. 11.—And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ [so *exalted*] is Lord, *to the glory of* GOD *the Father.*

219. Col. i. 3.—To GOD and the Father or, *the God and Father*] of our Lord Jesus Christ.

No.

220. Col. i. 13.—Who [the *Father*] hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of *his dear Son.*

221. —— ib. 15.—Who is the *image* of the invisible GOD, the *first-born of every creature.*

222. —— ib. 19.—For *it pleased the Father*, that in him [Christ] should all fullness dwell.

223. —— ib. 20.—And *by him* to reconcile all things to himself.

224. —— ii. 12.—The operation of GOD, who hath *raised him from the dead.*

225. —— ib. 15.—Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them *in it*, or [more correctly] *in him;* i. e. *in Christ.*

226. —— iii. 1.—Where Christ sitteth *on the right hand of* GOD.

227. 1 Thess. i. 10.—Whom *he* [GOD] *raised from the dead.*

228. —— v. 9.—GOD hath—*appointed* us—to obtain salvation, *by our Lord Jesus Christ.*

229. 2 Thess. ii. 14.—*He* [GOD] *called* you—to the obtaining of the glory of our *Lord Jesus Christ.*

230. 1 Tim. vi. 14.—Until the appearing of our *Lord Jesus Christ.*

231. —— ib. 15.—Which in his times *he* [the *Father*] shall shew, who is the blessed and *only* potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

232. —— ib. 16.—Who *only* hath immortality, dwelling in the light, which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen or can see; to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.

No.

233. 2 Tim. i. 1.—Paul, an apostle of *Jesus Christ*, by *the will of* God, according to the promise of life, which is *in Christ Jesus.*

234. —— i. 8.—Be thou a partaker of the afflictions of the gospel, according to the power of God, [the Father.]

235. —— ib. 9.—Who hath saved us—according to *his own purpose and grace*, which was given to us *in Christ Jesus.*

236. Titus iii. 4.—The kindness and love of God [the Father] our Saviour, [the original *Source* of all salvation.]

237. —— ib. 5.—which *He* shed on us abundantly, *through Jesus Christ, our* [anointed] *Saviour.*

238. Heb. i. 2.—God—hath in these last days spoken unto us *by his Son.*

239. —— ib. 3.—Whom *He* hath *appointed* heir of all things, *by whom* also He made the worlds.

240. —— ib. 3.—Who being *the brightness* of his glory, and the *express image* of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his [*the Father*'s] power—sat down *on the right hand of the Majesty on high.*

241. —— ib. 4.—Being *made* so much *better* than the angels, as he *hath by inheritance obtained* a more excellent name than they.

242. —— ib. 5.—For unto which of the angels said he at any time, *Thou art my Son, this day have I caused* thee?* And again; *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?*

243. —— ib. 6.—And again; when *He bringeth in the first-born into the world*, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship [or *honour*] him.

* Stockius.——Schleusner.

No.

244. Heb. i. 8.—But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O GOD, [as the *Head* or *Governor*—so *exalted* and *appointed* by *me*] is for ever and ever, [for the permanent dispensation]—a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

245. —— ib. 9.—Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; *therefore* GOD, even THY GOD, *hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows:* [above all orders of *created* beings]

246 —— ib. 13—But to which of the angels said He at any time, *Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?*

247. —— ii. 5.—Unto the angels hath He [GOD] *not put* in subjection the world to come.

248. —— ib 8.—Thou hast *put* all things in subjection under *his* [*Christ*'s] feet.

249. —— ib. 9.—That *he* [*Jesus*] by *the grace of* GOD [the *gracious will* of GOD] should taste death for every man.

250. —— ib. 11.—For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, [*Christ* and *true Christians*] are all of *One*, [of GOD] for which cause *he* [*Christ*] is not ashamed to call them *brethren*.

251. —— ib. 12.—Saying, I will declare *thy* name unto *my brethren*; in the midst of the church *will I sing praise unto thee.*

252. —— ib. 13.—I will *put my trust in Him.* And again; *I*, and the children which GOD hath *given me.*

253. —— ib 14.—He also himself likewise *took part* of—flesh and blood.

254. —— ib. 17.—That *he* [*Christ*] might be a merciful and faithful *High-Priest*, in things pertaining to GOD.

No.

255. Heb. iii. 1.—The *apostle* and *high priest* of our profession, *Christ Jesus.*

256. —— ib. 2 —Who was *faithful to him that appointed him*, as also Moses was faithful in all his house.

257. —— ib. 3 —This *man (Christ)* was counted worthy of more *glory* than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house, hath more honour than the house.

258. —— ib. 4.—For every house is builded by some man; but *He* that builded *(made of naught*, or *ordained*, as several learned men render it*) all* things, is God.

259. —— ib. 5, 6.—And Moses verily was *faithful*, in all his house, as a *servant;* — But *Christ, as a Son*, over *his* own house, &c.

260. —— v. 5 —So also Christ *glorified not himself*, to be made an high priest, but *He* that said unto him, thou art *my Son*, this day have I caused thee.

261. —— ib. 7.—Who in the days of his flesh, when he had *offered up prayers and supplications*, with *strong crying and tears*, unto *him* that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared.

262. —— ib. 8.—Though he were a *Son*, yet learned he *obedience* by the things which he suffered.

263. —— ib. 9.—And being *made perfect*, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.

264. —— ib. 10.—*Called of* God, an *high priest*, after the order of Melchisedec.

265. —— vi. 20.—Whither the forerunners for us entered, even Jesus, *made an high priest for ever*, after the order of Melchisedec.

No.

266. Heb. vii. 25.—Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost, *that come unto* God *by him*, seeing he ever liveth to *make intercession for them.*

267. —— ib. 26.—For such an high-priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, *separate from sinners*, and *made* higher than the heavens.

268. —— viii. 1.—We have such an *high-priest*, who *is set on the right-hand* of the Majesty in the heavens.

269. —— ib. 2.—A *minister* of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle.

270. —— ix. 12.—Having *obtained* eternal redemption for us.

271. —— ib. 14.—Offered *himself* without spot to God.

272. —— ib. 24.—For Christ is not entered, ——; but into heaven itself, now *to appear in the presence of* God *for us.*

273. —— x. 7.—Lo! I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) *to do thy will.*

274. —— ib. 12.—But this man [person] after he had *offered* one sacrifice for sins, for ever *sat down on the right hand of* God.

275. —— ib. 21.—Having *an high-priest* over the *house of* God.

276. —— ib. 22.—And having an *high-priest* over the *house of* God, let us draw near, &c.

277. —— xii. 2.—Who for the joy that *was set before him*, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down *at the right hand of the throne of* God.

278. —— ib. 23.—And to God the *Judge of all.*

279. —— ib. 24.—And to *Jesus* the *mediator of the new covenant.*

280. —— xiii. 15.—*By him*, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually.

No.

281. Heb. xiii. 20.—Now the GOD of peace, *that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus.*

282. —— ib. 21.—*Working* in you that which is *well-pleasing* in *his* sight, *through Jesus Christ.*

283. 1 Peter i. 3.—*Blessed be the* GOD *and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, which according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ* from the dead.

284. —— ib. 20.—Who (Christ) verily was *foreordained* before the foundation of the world, but *was manifest* in these last times for you.

285. —— ib. 21.—Who by him do believe *in* GOD *that raised him up from the dead*, and *gave him glory*; that your faith and hope *might be in* GOD.

286. —— ii. 3, 4.—If so be ye have tasted that *the Lord* is gracious: to whom coming as unto a living stone, *chosen of* GOD and precious.

287. —— ib. 5.—To offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to GOD, *through Jesus Christ.*

288. —— ib. 23.—But (Christ) *committed himself* to him that judgeth righteously.

289. —— iii. 22.—Who is *on the right hand of* GOD, angels, and authorities, and powers being *made subject* to him.

290. —— iv. 1.—Christ has *suffered* for us in the flesh.

291. —— ib. 11.—That GOD in all things may be *glorified through Jesus Christ.*

292. —— ib. 10.—The GOD of all grace, who hath *called us* unto his eternal glory *by Christ Jesus.*

No.

293. 2 Pet. i. 17.—For he *received from* God *the Father, honour and glory*, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, *this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*

294. 1 John ii. 22.—Who is a liar but he that denieth that *Jesus* is the *Christ* [the *anointed.*]

295. —— iv. 3.—Every spirit that confesseth not that *Jesus Christ* is *come in the flesh*, is not of God.

196. —— ib. 9.—God *sent his only Son* into the world that we might live *through him.*

297. —— ib. 10.—*He* (God) loved us, and *sent his Son* to be the propitiation for our sins.

298. —— iv. 14.—And we have seen and do testify, that *the Father sent the Son* to be the Saviour of the world.

299. —— v. 1.—Whosoever believeth that *Jesus* is the *Christ*, is born of God; and every one that loveth *him that caused*, loveth him also that *is caused* of him.

300. 2 John 7.—For many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that *Jesus Christ* is *come in the flesh.*

301. Jude iv.—Denying *the only Lord* God, and our Lord *Jesus Christ.*

302. Rev. i. 1.—The revelation of *Jesus Christ*, which God *gave unto him.*

303. —— ib. 5, 6.—Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood; and hath made us kings and priests unto God *and his Father*, [or, to his God *and Father.*]

304. —— ii. 26, 27.—To him will I *give power* over the nations; —— even as *I received of my Father.*

305. —— iii. 12.—Him that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of *my* God;

No.

—— and I will write upon him the name of *my* God, and the name of the city of *my* God, which cometh down out of heaven from *my* God.

306. Rev. iii. 14.—These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true *witness*, the *beginning of the creation of* God.

307. —— iii. 21.—To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with *my Father* in *his* throne.

308. —— xv. 3.—And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the *Lamb*, saying, great and marvellous are thy works, *Lord* God *Almighty, &c.*

309. —— xix. 13.—And *He* was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called, *the word of* God.

310. —— ib. 15.—And *he* treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of *Almighty* God.

From the foregoing extracts out of the *New Testament*, it must be evident to every sensible, candid reader, that the character of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ is truly that of a being *inferior* to the *God and Father of Spirits; formed* of him; *appointed* by him; and all his offices *subject* to HIS *supreme* and *infinite* power! From such an unparalleled *cloud* of sacred *witness* it must also appear to such readers, if they pay *any* regard to divine authority, how irreverent and presumptuous it is for any, professing Christianity as a revelation from heaven, to contend that the *Son* is *God*, in a supreme and eternal sense; that he is otherwise than the *appointed, instrumental* Saviour of men! Also how unwarrantable and abominable it must be in the sight of heaven, for *men* to reproach and vilify

their fellow beings, and seek to exclude them from Christian communion, because they maintain this great scriptural distinction, in their testimony to the *unity of God the Father!!*—Hear! ye perverters of divine truth, and be ashamed of such error and such conduct!

Of the HOLY GHOST, or SPIRIT.

HAVING in the foregoing series given at length those passages of the New Testament, wherein the SON is represented as *being subordinate*, and *acting* in all things *subordinately*, to the FATHER; I proceed to give references to those, respecting the *Holy Spirit.*

I. Passages, in which the *Holy Spirit* is represented as the *author* and *worker* of *miracles*, even of those done by, or by means of *our Lord himself*, in the principal actions of his life on earth; and these are as follow, in number *twenty-eight.*

Matt. i. 18, 20; iv. 1; xii. 18, 28.—Luke i. 35; ii. 40; iv. 1; xiv. 48.—John i. 32; iii. 34.—Acts i. 2; ii. 4; x. 38, 45, 46; xix. 6.—Rom. i. 4; xv. 19. —1 Cor. ii. 4, 5; xii. 4, 8; xiv. 2.—1 Thes. i. 5.—1 Tim. iii. 16.—Heb. ii. 4; ix. 14.—1 Peter iii. 18.

II. Passages wherein the *Holy Spirit* is declared to be the *inspirer* of the prophets and apostles, and the *director* and *teacher* of the Apostles, in the work of their ministry. These are as follow, in number *fifty-two.*

Mark xii. 32; xiii. 11.—Luke i. 15, 41, 67; ii. 25, 26; xii. 12.—John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13. —Acts i. 2, 8, 16; ii. 4; iv. 8, 31; vi. 3, 10;

xi. 15; viii. 29, 39; x. 19, 20; xi. 12, 13; ii. 4; xv. 28; xvi. 6, 7; xx. 23, 28; xxi. 4, 11; xxviii. 25, 26, 27.—Rom. viii. 23.—1 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 40; xii. 11.—Ephes. iii. 5.—1 Tim. iv. 1.—Heb. iii. 7; ix. 8; x. 15.—1 Peter i. 11, 12.—2 Peter i. 21.—Rev. i. 10; ii. 7; iv. 2; xiv. 13; xvii. 3; xxi. 10.

III. Passages wherein the *Holy Spirit* is declared to be the *sanctifier* of all hearts, and the *comforter* and *supporter* of good men, in the practice of their duty. In number *forty-seven.*

Matt. iii. 11.—John iii. 5, 8; xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26.—Acts vi. 5; ix. 31; xi. 24; xiii. 52.—Rom. i. 4; v. 5; viii. 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 26; xiv. 17; xv. 13.—Rom. xv. 16.—1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 11, 19; xii. 3, 13.—1 Cor. i. 22; iii. 3; vi. 6.—Gal. v. 5, 16, 22.—Ephes. v. 9, 18; vi. 18.—Phil. i. 19; ii. 1.—Col. i. 8.—1 Thes. i. 6.—2 Thes. ii. 13.—1 Tim. iv. 12.—2 Tim. i. 7, 14.—Tit. iii. 5.—1 Pet. i. 2, 22.—Jude 20.

IV. Passages wherein are contained the other *highest* expressions, concerning the *Holy Spirit* in the New Testament. In number *eighteen.*

Matt. xii. 31, 32.—Luke i. 35.—John xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13.—Acts v. 3, 4; vii. 51; xv. 28.—1 Cor. ii. 10, 11; iii. 16; vi. 19.—2 Cor. iii. 17, 18.—Heb. ix. 14.—1 Peter i. 12; iii. 18; iv. 14.—1 John v. 6.—Rev. xxii. 17.

V. Passages, wherein is declared what *honour* is due to the *Holy Spirit;* and how his good motions are to be diligently *obeyed* and *not resisted.* In number *eleven.*

Matt. xxviii. 19.—Acts v. 9; vii. 51.—Rom. ix. 1; xv. 30.—2 Cor. xiii. 14.—Ephes. iv. 30.—1 Thes. v. 19.—Heb. x. 29.—Jude 20.

VI. Passages wherein it is expressly declared that the *Holy Spirit* is *subordinate* to the *Father*—de-

rives his *being* from him—is *sent* by him—and *acts in all things* according to his supreme will and pleasure. In number *fifty*.

Matt. iii. 16; xii. 18.—Luke xi. 13.—John iii 34; xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13.—Acts i. 4, 5; ii. 17, 18, 33, 38; v. 32; viii. 18, 19, 20; x. 38, 45; xi. 17; xv. 8.—Rom v. 5; viii. 11, 15, 26, 27.—1 Cor. ii. 10, 11, 12; vi. 19; xii. 6, 7, 8, 9.—2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5; vi. 4, 6, 7.—Gal. iv. 6.—Ephes. i. 13, 17: ii. 18; iii. 16; iv. 4, 5, 6, 30. 1 Thes. iv. 4.—2 Thes. ii. 13.—2 Tim. i. 7.—Tit. iii. 4, 5, 6.—Heb. ii. 3; vi. 4; ix. 14.—1 Peter i 12.—1 John ii. 20; iii. 24; iv. 13; v. 6.

VII. Passages wherein the *Holy Spirit* is represented as being *subordinate* to the *Son*, being his *Spirit*, and *sent* or *given* by *him*. In number *twelve*.

Matt. iii. 11—John vii. 39; xv 26; xvi. 7, 14, 15; xx. 22—Acts ii. 33; ix. 17.—Rom. viii. 9.—Gal. iv. 6.—Phil. i. 19.—1 Peter i. 11.

VIII. Passages wherein the FATHER, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit* are mentioned in various ways, *together*. In number *forty-three*.

Matt. xii. 28; xxviii. 18, 19.—Luke i. 35.—John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26.—Acts ii. 33; v. 31, 32; vii. 55; x. 38.—Rom. i. 1, 3, 4; v 5, 6; viii. 9, 11; xv. 15, 16, 18, 19, 30.—1 Cor. vi. 11; xii. 3, 4, 5, 6.—2 Cor. i. 21, 22; iii. 3; xiii. 14.—Gal. iv. 6.—Ephes. i. 17; ii. 18, 21, 22; iv. 4 5, 6.—2 Thes. ii. 13, 14.—2 Tim. i. 7, 8.—Tit. iii. 4, 5, 6.—Heb. ii. 3, 4; ix. 14.—1 Peter i. 2; iii. 18; iv. 14.—1 John iv. 2, 3; xiii. 14; v. 5, 6, 7.*—Jude 20, 21.—Rev. i. 4, 5, 9, 10.

* The passage in the seventh verse must not be alluded to, without a special remark, even in this place, that it is undoubtedly *spurious*, for reasons largely assigned in other parts of this volume.

From the various references under the first seven divisions, if *harmony* and *consistency* be at all regarded, it must appear, that however the nature and operations of the *Holy Spirit* are mentioned, they are to be taken (as of the *Son*, before) in a sense wholly *subordinate* to the FATHER, the supreme eternal *Fountain* of power, grace, and glory: they must be taken as *proceeding from* the FATHER, in, by, or through, the *appointed* administration of his ever-blessed *Son*. They are to be taken as *distinct* from the infinite original character of the *one* only adorable GOD; but not so as to the *formed* and *appointed* character of the *Son*; on whom this *Holy Spirit*, in the constitution of his nature, was originally poured forth, beyond all comparison with that of *men*, or with any order of *angels*. And he has the transcendantly glorious, though *delegated* office, of celestial communication and *transfusion* of that *Holy Ghost*, or the *Comforter*, whereby men are to seek, obtain, and maintain, acceptance with GOD.

This exalted, this highly-exalted office of the *Son*, it is yet remarkable, he does *not* exercise, but with an awful reverence of the supreme pleasure of his heavenly *Father*, as the *Fountain* of all power and authority; for he says himself, in the most solemn of sensible interviews with his disciples, before his re-ascension to his heavenly sphere—" I will *pray* " *the Father*, and *he* shall give you another Com- " forter, that he may abide with you for ever, even " the *Spirit* of truth; whom the world cannot re- " ceive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth " him: but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, " and shall be in you.—*I* will not leave you *com-* " *fortless*; *I* will come unto you."

John xiv. 16, 17, 18.

" But the *Comforter*, which is the *Holy Ghost*, " whom the *Father* will send in *my* name, he shall

" teach you all things, and bring all things to your
" remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."
Ib. 26.

" But when the *Comforter* is come, whom *I* will
" *send* unto you *from the Father*, even *the Spirit*
" of truth, which *proceedeth from the Father*, he
" shall testify of me.——John xv. 26.

" I tell you of a truth, it is expedient for you that
" *I* go away; for if *I* go not away, the *Comforter*
" [as my *representativé*] will not come unto you;
" but if *I* depart *I* will *send* him unto you."
John xvi. 7.

With respect to the *eighth* division; in whatever words the characters or persons of the FATHER, *Son*, and *Spirit*, are mentioned *together*, or in any connexion or relation; it is evident that *consistency* requires us to understand that GOD and the FATHER are used as synonymous terms of *pre-eminence*; but not, either *two* or *three* persons *connectedly*, as such. *Those* ideas have been the work of human imagination; obscuring, perverting, and confounding the simplicity of *revealed* truth.

In addition to these remarks, I shall add another very important one, in the words of that learned and truly excellent author, (to whose researches I own myself much indebted) Dr. SAMUEL CLARKE:

" What the proper metaphysical *Nature*, *Essence*,
" or *Substance*, of any of these Divine Persons is,
" the Scripture has no where at all declared; but
" describes and distinguishes them always by their
" *personal characters, offices, powers*, and *attri-*
" *butes*."——" All reasonings, therefore, (beyond
" what is strictly *demonstrable* by the most evident
" and undeniable light of nature) deduced from their
" *supposed* metaphysical *Nature*, *Essence*, or *Sub-*
" *stance*, instead of their *personal characters, offi-*
" *ces, powers*, and *attributes*, delivered in *Scripture*,
" are uncertain,—and at best but probable hypo-
" theses."

This is undeniable truth, and what will in general be subscribed to by all descriptions of professed Christians. Happier would it be for Christendom, if men would content themselves as readily with the *consistent tenor* of the Scripture accounts respecting those *characters*, *offices*, *powers*, and *attributes*; not inventing for themselves (and less allowably for others) senses and connexions which the Scriptures do *not* declare; articles which are neither necessary for the promotion of general piety and virtue—for the performance of true worship—or to render accountable beings ever the more acceptable in the sight of heaven!

FINIS.

ERRATA.

It is possible that other errors ofthe press may have escaped the Author's notice, but the Reader is requested to correct the following:

Page 175.—Fifth line from the bottom, for *precludes*, read *preclude*.

182.—In the last note, after *as*, insert *unjustly casting*.

226.—In the seventh line of the second paragraph, for *this*, read *his*. And in the next line for *his* read *this*.

234.—Line sixteenth, for *with*, read *by*. Also in line seventeen.

244.—In third line from the bottom, dele *to be*.

248.—In line the fourth, after *Christianity* insert a *comma*.

251.—Correct an accidental error in the arrangement, by reading the Committee's *Report* before the Yearly Meeting's final *minute*.

266.—In line the seventh from the bottom, read *various*.

Cruttwell, Printer, Bath.

THE RECORDER:

BEING A COLLECTION OF

Tracts and Disquisitions,

CHIEFLY RELATIVE TO THE

MODERN STATE AND PRINCIPLES

OF

THE PEOPLE CALLED

QUAKERS.

VOL. II.

BY

WILLIAM MATTHEWS,

OF BATH.

Gather up the Fragments which remain, that nothing be lost.
John vi. 12.

Happy is the Man that findeth Wisdom, and the Man that getteth Understanding. *Prov.* iii. 13.

BATH,

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY R. CRUTTWELL;

PUBLISHED BY

J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON;

AND SOLD BY ALL THE BOOKSELLERS.

1803.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

SECOND VOLUME.

WHEN I published, last Summer, the first volume under this title, I did not expect so soon to publish the second: nor have there been wanting to me many avocations of a different nature, which might have been sufficient for an ordinary course of industry. But the subjects and circumstances which induced a beginning of the work, have lain too much on my mind to admit of any long lapse of time in the continuation. Time is fleeting and uncertain, and to individuals must soon close. Whoever, therefore, has the power of pursuing those objects which he deems of chief importance to his future satisfaction, has the strongest motives to vigilance.—It may happen that some persons, who from curiosity shall become my readers, may be ready to reply, that such vigilance might have been spared, without disadvantage to the cause of religion. Such an opinion is to be expected, where sentiments which strike at the root of long habits and strong prejudices, are earnestly enforced. But others will form a different judgment.

And if my motives were those of merely gaining approbation among the more reflecting and ingenuous part of mankind, I need not wholly despair of success. Mere approbation, however, I do not seek; but am largely conscious of superior motives. The hope of usefully setting forth certain doctrines and arguments of great importance to be considered and understood, has been the chief stimulus to my activity.

From the present publication, I cannot propose to myself much of the credit of authorship; for my claims to attention are chiefly in the humble walk of an editor. And were my talents for original composition very superior to what I ever supposed, the many monuments of judicious industry in polemical writings, which exist in point, but which from various causes are become too little known, might well prevent my attempting to say as an author, what I might with justice and gratitude shew to have been admirably said before. Indeed it is one of those considerations which may tend powerfully to repress the efforts even of literary men, that labours the most excellent in themselves, and in their tendency, had been largely anticipated by foregoing writers—by men who had so spent the time of their sojourning here, as to have been worthy of the grateful remembrance of posterity; but whose laudable pains in the cause of truth are either unknown to one class, or not fairly mentioned by another. Some of the articles which compose the following volume, I consider as of this description. It must be obvious, that they are selected in proof of principles which I myself have embraced. Certainly they are; and I believe them, in general, to be such as are worthy of being embraced by the whole Christian world. No inferior persuasion could have induced me thus to bring them forward. I do not,

however, say, that I believe them to be all *equally* clear and demonstrative. But I have no difficulty in saying that they all appear to me abundantly more clear and scriptural than their *opposites*; which, wherever they have obtained belief, I consider to have injured the best interests of true religion. The sublime and sacred doctrine of *the Unity of* God, as revealed in the most ancient records, is, in my estimation, so clearly a fundamental doctrine of all divine religion, that it can never be too much insisted on in any age of the world, or in any society which lays claim to the Christian faith. It is among the first revelations, laws, and commandments of the Author of universal nature. The principle, indeed, will be very generally allowed, in some sense or other; and charity requires me to suppose, that among all descriptions of believers, each believes that *his* sense, if he have any definitive one, is most agreeable to the original and only true faith. But the very idea of a difference of senses, implies a certainty that while one only is strictly right, the others must be wrong. This furnishes a justifiable ground for offering some of those kinds of evidence, from the general mass, which appear to me strong and consistent. And as it is generally agreed that the senses most conformable to Christian testimony and induction are most worthy of assent, I lay in my claim to attention on that main foundation. I am the more encouraged to do this, because, if ever there was a man who could claim full credit for the disinterestedness of his motives, as having no party interests to serve, no personal points to contend for, I am such a man. Unconnected by strict membership with any sect or society, and having no views of ever becoming so connected, I may without arrogance avow a disinterested love of truth—a Christianity unbiassed by human fears or partial

expectations. If, notwithstanding these professions, I may be liable to suspicion of having some partial leaning to one society of professed Christians, among whom I was educated, and among whom I have a liking to converse, this I do not deny. Educated among the Friends, (commonly called Quakers) I avow my sincere and cordial affection for that body, and have never ceased to cherish for them the most uniform good-will. They have my warm solicitude for their increasing happiness and prosperity as a body; and especially, that some of the peculiarities of their Gospel simplicity may spread through the various ranks of society. Neither in the maintenance of such affections can I think myself less than the warm friend of humanity at large. Their strict and peaceable construction of divers Christian doctrines is too well known, and its tendency too generally allowed, to make my attachment the cause either of proper suspicion or disesteem. Had some of their peculiar opinions of Christianity more generally prevailed in the professing Christian world, how widely different would have been its moral condition! What malignant jealousies in church and state would have been precluded—what horrible massacres on the score of faith, what mortal aggravations, what infernal trading in slaves and souls of men, what foul and insolent ambition, what torrents of blood, would have been prevented! —These obvious considerations are more than sufficient to warrant a partiality to such a people! But even supposing them for such reasons to claim a strong preference in my estimation, it will not follow that I shall have no cause to question the perfection of *all* their opinions. If, without their full avowal of *Trinitarian* faith, they are found leaning to opinions which involve it; and if such opinions are making a traditional progress among their chief

leaders, it becomes allowable in me, or in any man so situated, to state the difficulties of their support. It is abundantly justifiable to ask for attention to such difficulties, and by any sober means to shew the soundness of the opposite doctrine. This I have further attempted to do; and as the reading of many of my former brethren is known to be much confined to their own deceased authors, in whom this subject has not been largely discussed; or to modern productions, whereby they may be unwarily misled; I have resolved to re-publish such portions from various writers, as may be useful for their information. In doing this, I do not confine my views of advantage to the Society of *Friends* only; but am not without hope, that some other serious readers may be profited by what I offer. Those parts which concern the *revealed* divine unity of the Almighty Father, and the derived character of the *appointed* Lord and Saviour of the world, are particularly recommended to the close attention of such as may not have carefully considered the subjects. They are closely connected with the very foundation of devotional faith. Much of the harmony and comfort of social worship depends upon the sound agreement of those who profess to worship together: and a sound agreement is not likely to result from implicit faith in tradition, or in the constructive senses put by human invention on the sacred scriptures. And where sound faith in particular points of scripture doctrines must largely depend on the accuracy of scripture translations and renderings, though the most perfect accuracy be not essential to salvation, yet will a superior pleasure and advantage be derived from clear and consistent apprehensions,—from a consistent view of the tenor of what is offered for our perception and belief. And the clear discovery of that tenor is not doubtful, respecting the supreme

character of the Almighty Father, and the divinely-derived characters of the Son and the Holy Spirit. While their respective *essential* qualities are not the subjects of revelation, and therefore not properly of human enquiry, those eternal distinctions, which men have confounded, are highly important to our mental satisfaction and social peace. May every serious enquiry be blessed to those ends!

The *final allotment* of the numberless multitude of human beings, distinguished as they must be by numberless degrees of positive guilt, and of comparative innocence, is a subject of awful contemplation. Vain and presumptuous men, by their bold construction of original words and phrases of scripture, have attempted to divide literally into two classes, the whole race of mankind, from the beginning to the end of the world. They have also presumed to limit the will, if not the power, of an infinite and an infinitely-gracious Being, concerning them. Thus have they consigned, as a consequence of their various presumption, to the most tremendous doom of *unceasing torment*, the greatest part of the rational creation,—of the great family of a most merciful and omnipotent *Father!* Thus, also, while they profess belief in the "*unmerited atonement of an infinite Saviour*," they limit to a comparatively small number of *elect*, and of a pre-ordained elect, the benefits of that unmerited atonement and salvation! The great majority, an innumerable multitude, are to be eternally lost in infinite torments! Men have not been wanting to aggravate their notions of such torments by very extravagant statements, and this under the profession of illustrating the doctrines of the Gospel, and honouring the character of the *Most High!* One of them may be sufficient here: "That if every grain of sand on all the sea-shores of the universe were to represent a million of

ages, and were it practicable to multiply into one total sum all those countless millions of ages; that sum would be infinitely short of that vast eternity of ages, through which those who are not of the *elect* shall be tormented in burning brimstone without remedy!". And all this as a sacrifice to the *justice* of an infinitely-good and gracious GOD!! Who that has any consistent sobriety of religion can consider such ideas otherwise than as the wildest sallies of madmen? of men whose feelings and apprehensions have been disordered and perverted in the extreme? Who can bear these reflections, without the deepest mourning over the miserable religion of such believers? And yet what do the greater part of common believers in the doctrine of future torments say less (save, perhaps, in the article of reprobation from all eternity) than do such men? They may refrain from the enthusiasm of a tremendous calculation; they may not insult the Majesty of Heaven by studied aggravations against his glorious attributes—but they have in general but a simple distinction between the *righteous* who shall be mercifully saved, and the *wicked* who shall be *endlessly* tormented, according to the *supposed* doctrine of the scriptures! They acknowledge, indeed, a *Saviour*,—something about atonement by his sufferings and death, and redemption through him: but they seem to have no conception of any extensive sense in which his divine dispensation, his suffering life, his meritorious death and sacrifice, were to be made an atonement for the sins of the world; whereby any general deliverance should be purchased, and become possible; whereby any limitation should be procured to the torments of those who may be doomed to suffer, according to the "righteous judgments" of Him, "whose mercy never faileth, but endureth for ever," and who

"afflicteth not willingly the children of men." They either know not, or will not listen to, any distinction between the senses of the words translated *eternal* and *everlasting*, as applicable to numerous *finite* subjects, and that awful *infinite* sense in which the Creator of all things visible and invisible is *eternal!* And to tell them of such actual and necessary distinctions is, according to them, to insult their piety, and to palm a kind of impious heresy on the Old and New Testament,—that very volume wherein those distinctions abound. But let me say here, in an appropriate sense, *Thanks be unto* GOD, *who giveth us the victory*, (over such opinions) *through our Lord Jesus Christ.* He became a propitiation for sin, by the fulfilment of the law of sacrifices, and the universal sin-offering for all generations—"a ransom for all, to be testified in due time" —and the great accepted medium of eternal redemption. Some there are, indeed, who religiously believe, according to certain portions of scripture, that a discrimination will be made, whereby certain descriptions of sinners, as the just recompence for their impenitence and vileness, shall have no part in the general restoration, but shall finally suffer an eternal death by an extinction of existence; and that this shall be one effect of final mercy and deliverance, through the accepted sacrifice and mediation of Jesus Christ. How far this doctrine, as believed to be divinely taught, shall be deemed clear from any thing which shall follow in this volume, I desire to leave among the numerous articles of which we can have no absolute certainty. But I trust it will not be questioned that such a reality would be more consistent with Infinite Goodness than the supposition of *endless torment;* a punishment that must be inflicted without advantage to any being in the universe, and therefore without an adequate motive!

How far my own avowed faith shall be rendered more consistent and clear by any of the following quotations, I must leave others to judge of. But under all varieties of faith, we may fully console ourselves in this, that "the Judge of all the earth will do right,"—and that the *perfection of his mercy* will be equally glorious in what He accomplishes, and in what He denies, by the exercise of his infinite wisdom and power over all the solemnities of his universal empire!

The authors from whose works I have selected, are confessedly among the most valuable for learning, talents, and moral worth; men, who, though they professed themselves members of particular churches, were sensible of the doctrinal imperfections of all churches, and therefore concerned for reformation by a serious scriptural review of opinions: men, who deemed it of vast importance to think and believe *consistently*, of the revealed character and will of GOD, as connected with righteousness in this present world, and with the awfulness of a future state. Under these heads, it is obvious, that the main solicitude of accountable beings in religious society, may be considered as comprized: and under them, closely and devoutly sought, the highest happiness of the Christian Catholic Church is attainable. But from negligence of enquiry, implicit opinion, and consequent bigotry, the greatest deformity of faith, and the greatest infelicity, are sure to flow. In proportion as men learn to cultivate the rational powers of their minds, by the real lights of revelation afforded them, though they may feel their own incapacity for the positive understanding of some things *unrevealed*, or doubtfully explained, they will be great gainers in many valuable articles. While they gain in progressive clearness of conception as to what *is* revealed, they will also gain in safe and amiable

diffidence, where revelation is silent, and where no "inspiration of the ALMIGHTY" is designed to give them an understanding: they will gain in the good of Christian charity towards the sincere and pious of all descriptions: they will gain in a likeness to their Saviour himself, by setting an example of the mild and benevolent nature of his religion. All this will add strength to the general cause of truth, and most powerfully instruct the ignorant, the bigoted, the intolerant, and the vile.

W. M.

Bath, 1803.

N.B. *Since the publication of the first volume, a* general Epistle *of mine to the Society of* Friends *was deemed of sufficient consequence by some of that body to be printed in London. When the press was set, I found an inclination to have more struck off, than would probably be wanted for temporary circulation, with a view of annexing it to this second volume.—Thus it happens that the tract in question is added to most of the volumes of this impression. The circumstance of an* assumed signature *was resolved on for a particular reason at the time of writing.*

☞ The writer of the piece entitled "Considerations considered," in the first volume, being very desirous to have *one* verbal error of his rectified, which, according to him, he had been unable to do while circulating in MS.; the reader who will take the trouble, may now substitute the word *sufficient* for *adduced*, line 20, p. 162. This clue for correction is given in pure compliance with a kind of solemn injunction from the author. But the editor, sensible of its *triviality*, would have been more happy to insert the author's correction of his *other* numerous and much more important blemishes still remaining in the same piece.

EXTRACT FROM THE WORKS OF

THOMAS EMLYN;

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ACCOUNT

By W. M.

AMONG the many serious and sensible persons who have written at different times in support of the scripture doctrine of the *Divine Unity*, I know of none whose testimony is more worthy of regard, both for its clearness and evident sincerity, than that of *Thomas Emlyn*, a man of acknowledged learning, piety, and virtue. He was a minister of a dissenting congregation in Dublin, in the latter part of the 17th century, and till the year 1702. According to his own account of himself, and which seems highly probable from his qualifications and amiable disposition, he had lived in great harmony for many years with his flock; but suddenly, in the year aforesaid, he became suspected, by some few among them, of what they deemed an unsound opinion with regard to the supreme Divinity of Christ. He was accordingly arraigned by them, and persecuted in a most extraordinary manner: nor did their enmity cease, till they had obtained, by public accusation, and various false insinuations, the utmost *punishment* they could procure for him. There is something in the *spirit* and *manner* of procedure, although for obvious reasons not in *degree*, so simi-

lar to that commenced and pursued against our estimable friend *Hannah Barnard*, whose case is treated on in the first volume of this work, that I cannot refrain from noticing the coincidence. The interruption of this good man's ministry was as sudden and peremptory as that of hers; the clamour and calumny as loud and extensive, with perhaps as little understanding, among the multitude, of the real merits of the complaint. And I am free to own that, exclusive of the value of this author's reasoning in his defence, I am not the less induced by similarity, to select his case on the present occasion.

The narrative of his prosecution and sufferings, however interesting and instructive, is too long to be printed at large, consistently with my present design: I must therefore be content with giving a few extracts.

"Having been brought up," he says, "in the protestant religion, I did sincerely embrace the principles of that profession; and accordingly thought (what all true protestants profess) that I ought not to take my religion upon the credit of the common vogue, the authority of doctors and synods, or the laws of the state; but that I ought to search the Holy Scriptures, as the safest and unerring guide of faith, worship, and practice. I had often heard and read, the prelates and the doctors of the church of England have gloried in allowing to christians a judgment of discretion in matters of religion; and I knew the reformation from popery had been founded on that principle."—"I had further been instructed, that in all the important articles of the christian faith, a good christian is bound to an open profession; yea, and by all sober methods, to propagate truth and knowledge; that he must not only *believe with his heart*, but also *confess with his mouth*; and that to be ashamed of Christ and his words, is at the

" peril of our eternal salvation. Not to profess vi-
" sibly, what we believe to be true religion, is an
" open disowning of God; for he that believes that
" this is the will of God, and is ashamed or afraid
" openly to avow it, declares either that he is asha-
" med of God, or that he fears man more than God.

" I could not but observe that persecution for re-
" ligion, and merely speculative opinions which
" hurt no man's civil rights, had been oft and ge-
" nerally condemned by protestants of this age; and
" that nothing laid a greater odium on a late neigh-
" bouring prince than this, that he persecuted his
" peaceable protestant subjects, though it was un-
" der the charge of *heresy* and *blasphemy*. And
" indeed where charity is esteemed (as with Saint
" *Paul)* the greatest of virtues, even greater than
" faith in all mysteries, there persecution, the most
" uncharitable thing in the world, must needs be
" deemed the greatest of crimes; for which reason
" that apostle reproaches himself as *the chief of*
" *sinners*, because he had been, though with good
" meaning, a persecutor,—the worst of criminals.

" Men may fancy some countenance given to
" severities from the *Jewish* law; but 'tis a dis-
" honour to the Holy Jesus to make the practices
" of an hard-hearted people (who were dispensed
" with in some things not most excellent in them-
" selves) a pattern to his disciples, who are bound
" to exceed them so far in his *new commandment*
" of love and goodness! And yet it is a plain truth,
" that the Jewish law itself never warranted such
" severity as christian persecutors exercise. It did
" never teach them to destroy or afflict their bre-
" thren, who believed in the *one true God*, and re-
" verenced his law, as the sacred rule of their faith
" and worship, only because they differed in their
" interpretation of some parts of it, or in the infer-
" ences they drew from thence."

Again: "Might not any protestant then, all "these things considered, venture upon a serious ex- "amination of modern creeds by the light of Re- "velation, the words of Christ's own mouth, and "the writings of his inspired Apostles? Or might "not I, who had been brought up in a dili- "gent study of the Scriptures, and admitted to be "a teacher of others, justly expect the liberty of "declaring what I judged to be the doctrine of the "gospel, though rejected by others not more infal- "lible than myself? I am sure I was under too "serious impressions and concern of soul, to treat "the argument with ludicrous derision or indecent "scurrility, or any real token of designed contempt "of the Holy Jesus.—I wrote my *Humble En- "quiry*, &c. [the following Treatise] as one grieved "in spirit and afflicted, forsaken of my people and "my friends, and abandoned to the reproaches, in- "dignation, or contempt of all round about me; "cast out as a despised broken vessel, in which is "no pleasure: so that I had nothing to support me in "this case, but that I was maintaining the cause of "the God of gods, and the truth of Jesus his Son."

Again: "No religion loses its credit by persecu- "tion so much as the Christian; because it makes "such high demands of meekness, patience, and "charity, from all its disciples; and represents its "holy Author as an utter enemy to all injurious "usage of any man, on the score of his different "faith: the whole burden of the New Testament "is tenderness and meekness, to those who *oppose "themselves*, and much more to those who differ "in matters of *doubtful disputation*, though never "so great. Therefore, if Christians persecute, In- "fidels and Aliens will either think their religion "teaches to do so, and then they will hate it; or "they will think such Christians do not believe

" their religion, and so will suspect it; which is not
" likely to make them proselytes."

Methinks I hear some of my adverse readers begin to reply, "These quotations may be very true, " and such language proper enough for such a man " to have held; but what has it to do with the case " of Hannah Barnard, who was *not* persecuted, but " merely silenced and desired to return home, be- " cause she held unsound opinions?"

And is it then so clear that there was *no persecution* in her case? There was manifest disposition to inflict the utmost punishment that the power possessed afforded; and to magnify supposed offences as a justification. The first offence imputed, i. e. the doubting of the divine *commands* for the Jewish slaughters of mankind, is a notable instance of *Christian intolerance!* It is not probable to me, that even the Jewish governors themselves would have thought of punishing, or molesting, one of their own people, who should have expressed *doubts* at any future period, whether the recorded opinions of those *divine commands* were absolutely correct and sacred. *Emlyn* has this remark, respecting the nature of the Jewish law: "It was only severe toward such as " set up other gods, besides Him who was their only " King and State-Governor, or acted in a known " opposition to his laws, by a rebellion, which ten- " ded to subvert the very civil constitution of that " *theocracy*. Therefore, though the *Sadducees* " erred *greatly*, in their interpretation, *not know-* " *ing the scriptures*, and thought there was no " resurrection, or future rewards; yet were they " not persecuted, but admitted into government, " and into the sacred offices of the priesthood; nor " did our Lord blame the Jews for this *toleration*, " or rather comprehension. It is one thing to cast " off the known laws of God, by a direct or design- " ed opposition; and another to misunderstand, or

"unwillingly mistake them; so that the beggarly "elements of *Judaism* out-do, in charity and "mercy, the Christianity of some in this degene-"rate age; though charity be the distinguishing "badge of a Christian, and not of a Jew." How much more binding, then, was the law of true Christian charity towards one, who not only maintained the eternal unity, authority, sameness, goodness, and worthiness, to be adored, of that eternal God and Father; but who also maintained the increasing light and glory of the dispensation proclaimed by his ever-blessed Son; and who was concerned to preach, with all solemnity of faith, the virtue of the *new commandment* of universal love, and the saving influence of that virtue! And as to a *second* alledged cause of offence, would *Jews* have magnified into an offence, and have passed condemnation, on one of their people for a particular sentiment about the nature of the will of God towards their Father Abraham, in the trial of his faith by a call to sacrifice his Son? I do not expect an opponent will answer me, on behalf of the Jewish rulers, at any period of their history; but I have no difficulty in assuming a negative answer in their favour. And I can have no *more* difficulty in stating not only the non-necessity, but even the inconsistency, on Christian principles, of making a worthy Christian Minister a public offender, for a private sentiment extracted from her in private conversation. The prudence of her *publick* avowal of that sentiment afterwards, when it had been industriously mentioned to her discredit, is another matter; and by some it mght be considered as not *necessary*. But this does not furnish an excuse for the first *magnifiers* of the supposed error, (who profess the character of wise or discreet persons) and who certainly might have been better employed. But my main disign in this place is to notice the character and

circumstances of the persecuted author before me, respecting his opinions of the *divine unity*.—Of his first interrogation, by a single member of his congregation, he says, "By observing that I avoided "the common opinion, and those arguments which "are supposed to support it, he strongly suspected "my judgment to be against the *supreme* deity of "the Lord Jesus Christ:—Hereupon having put "Mr. Boyse upon the enquiry, he came with him "to my house, June 1702, acquainting me with "these jealousies, and desiring seriously to know "my real sentiments in the matter; adding, after "some discourse, that he did not know that any "one of the congregation, but himself, had any "such apprehensions." Thus, it seems, this worthy man, who had laboured in a spirit of love, and with the chief design of edifying his fellow Christians, in the main essentials of Christianity, for many years, without having been suspected by them of doctrinal errors, was to be interrogated and made an offender; a criminal offender, by the busy interference of one or two persons; which is a too common case in religious connexions, to the obstruction of the better part of Christian fellowship. Thus called on, he, like *our* friend, candidly declared himself, and incurred the consequences, which to him were sufficiently hard and un-christian. "I now thought myself bound," he says, "as a "Christian, to declare myself openly in so great a "point; and freely owned myself convinced, that "*the God and Father of Jesus Christ* is alone the "*Supreme* Being, and superior in excellency and "authority to his Son (or to that effect) who de-"rives all from *him*." This plainly scriptural doctrine, if there be any such, was enough to make him odious in the opinion of professed fellow Christians, and unfit him for any good word and work! And why?—Because, by a strange perversion of

some few passages of scripture, a few wayward men had contrived to set up doctrines of mystery and ambiguity, which had been gradually rendered orthodox, against the clearest evidence from the plainest and most positive declarations of the Son of God himself, and of the revealed wisdom of the Almighty Father! A conference, it seems, was immediately had of assuming *masters* in divinity, and our author was, in one day, cast off, and *ordered to preach no more*. He was advised to go away to London; which he, for the sake of peace, submissively did, but not without letters being written to the Brethren there to stigmatize him as heretical, and to excite a clamour against him, as a degraded and dangerous infidel.—His own reflexions, in his new situation, are thus feelingly expressed:—

"I now had leisure to look back; for when so "few days' space had made so great a change in my "condition, that I was turned out to wander abroad "desolate and in uncertainty, I saw I was entered "on a dark scene, and must arm for various, though "I knew not what, trials. What then were the "workings of my anxious thoughts! What the "deep reflexions and black presages! What the "conflicts of spirit! What the cries and tears be-"fore the God of all wisdom and comfort, is best "known to him who sees in secret. I could not "forbear saying oft with wandering afflicted David, "*if I shall find favour in the eyes of the Lord, he* "*will bring me back to see his ark, and his habi-*"*tation; but if he say, I have no delight in thee,* "*here am I, let him do as seemeth good to him.*— "I had not been of so unsocial a nature, as not to "relish the society and love of my dear friends, nor "was insensible to the pangs of a violent separa-"tion; nor yet so mortified to the world, as not "to feel some difference between contempt and re-

"spect, fulness and straits: but still my convic-
"ons of truth were so clear, that these things never
"staggered my resolutions of adhering to it, in the
"midst of all discouragements."

After about ten weeks' absence, in which he wrote and printed his "*Humble Enquiry into the scripture account of the Lord Jesus Christ*," he returned to his motherless children in Dublin, and, as it should seem, took some of his books with him. Immediately on this being discovered, some zealous dissenters resolved to have him *prosecuted*. Two of them were for *presenting* him, in legal form. But apprehensive that such a mode would be too slow for their purpose, one of them immediately obtained a warrant from the Lord Chief Justice to seize him and his books; went with the keeper of Newgate into his chamber, and executed the warrant; and became afterwards a very forward and eager witness at his trial! What is so eager, and persevering in persecution, as a spirit of blind bigotry, among Christian professors? Being carried before the Lord Chief Justice, and accused, the judge refused at first to take bail; but afterwards agreed, by consent of the Attorney General, to take the bond of two respectable persons in the sum of 800l. for his appearance to take his trial. This, he says, was in Hilary term, towards the end of which he was bound over to Easter term, when the Grand Jury found the bill, in which he was indicted of blasphemy; but as he could not in justice submit to this accusation, he chose to traverse. In the indictment, he was charged with expressions not in his book, and which were even *contrary* to his sentiments; and yet without comparison of the indictment with his book, the Grand Jury returned the bill as true! Such is the readiness with which, in religious *persecution*, crimes and offences are too commonly imputed and maintained! At length, after discover-

ing and taking time to amend their legal errors, came on, in the following term, the trial of this reputed blasphemer! One of his own more candid and relenting opposers informed him, that it was determined *to run him down like a wolf, without law.*—Too true, as the event proved! Six or seven Bishops were present, of whom the two Archbishops of *Armagh* and *Dublin* took the bench.—The fact of his being the author of the book not being provable, his old *friends* were called in to prove sentiments of his in private conversation, similar to those in the book; and thence they drew an inference that the book was his, and of course the blasphemy and sedition said to be contained in it. This was done in opposition to legal forms, and against all remonstrance of his counsel. The Lord Chief Justice proceeded to sum up presumptive evidence, magnifying inferences for evidence, refusing the prisoner the liberty of speaking in his defence, "and standing up "with great anger, told the Jury that if they ac-"quitted him, their Lords the Bishops were there, "or words to that effect!"—A fine example, this, of public justice, under the sanction of the chiefs of a Church, assuming the terrors of secular authority! From a Jury of ignorant and terrified tradesmen, in such a situation, what could be expected? They soon found the prisoner guilty! The Attorney General wanted to put him in the *pillory;* he was committed to prison, pending the determination. Meanwhile he was admonished to recant; but, for conscience sake, he could not retract the *blasphemy* of having quoted the words of Christ himself, "My Father is greater than I;" and of having believed and professed accordingly. When judgment was passed, it was this: to suffer a year's imprisonment, pay *one thousand pounds* to the Queen, to lie in prison till paid, and to find security for good behaviour during life! The consolation offered by

the Judge was, that the *pillory* was the punishment due; and that in Spain or Portugal it might have been *burning!* Such is the blindness and deformity of *bigotted human nature in power!* Private sects cannot, perhaps, be too thankful, that under all their temptations to impute errors and heresy, and to condemn as far as they can, they are happily limited in the dangerous article of power. I am willing to join them in such thankfulness, from a long-cherished regard to the corporal safety of those I love.—But to return, from a little digression, to the case of our deceased brother Emlyn: With more scriptural knowledge, sincerity, and fortitude, than all his adversaries, and with the feelings of a solitary father of little children, he was, as aforesaid, doomed to prison, where he remained for two years. Some of his former flock, of the poorer and perhaps the sincerer sort, who could not deliver him, but who knew his value, went occasionally, and worshipped with him in the prison-house, where, like Paul and Silas, he also prayed with and instructed his fellow-prisoners. After so long a period of confinement, nothing being found against him but what (as he believed) concerned the law of his God, he was set at liberty, on the payment, by his friends, of a moderated, tho' iniquitous, fine of seventy pounds.—It may afford some useful admonition against a censorious persecuting spirit in some of my readers, and consolatory encouragement to others, to read, before I close this introduction, a few of the late prisoner's reflections, after his liberation:

"And now, after all, I thank my most merci-
"ful God and Father, that as he called me not to
"this lot of suffering, till I had arrived at some
"maturity of judgment, and maturity of resolution,
"so he left me not, when my friends and acquain-
"tance forsook me; that he supported my spirit

" to endure this trial of my faith without waver-
" ing; that I was never so cast down as to be
" tempted to renounce the truth; that he pre-
" served my health under this long confinement;
" that I had a few friends who were a comfort to
" me in my bonds; that he inclined any in autho-
" rity to shew at last compassion to me; and that he
" has brought me out of prison, and *set my feet in*
" *a large place*; that I have yet food and raiment
" left me; and above all, that he has given me a
" mind, I think, as well contented with it as ever
" I was in my greatest prosperity. I am content to
" want the kind and vain respects of the world, and
" to give up my name to mistaken reproach; or to
" lose it, if that may be, in silent unregarded ob-
" scurity. I have suffered the loss of many things,
" and do not repent; but, upon the review, I do
" still *count it all but loss and dung*, if it has any
" way advanced the excellency of the knowledge of
" *Christ Jesus my Lord!* As a further ground of
" rejoicing, to see the light of important truth
" breaking forth in many other parts, and spread-
" ing abroad its beautiful ray. That God has rai-
" sed up divers others bold enough to profess it, and
" able enough, with his assistance, to defend it, I
" mean with weapons of a spiritual warfare, against
" those whose great confidence and dexterity are in
" those which are carnal. And though it has been
" my great *gravamen*, or misery, to be laid by in
" silence, so that I have been sometimes ready to
" lament myself as an unprofitable servant, turned
" out of his master's service: yet if I have contri-
" buted any thing to retrieve the injured honour of
" the peerless majesty of the one God and Father of
" our *Lord Jesus* (whom to be like to was the great
" glory of that *Lord Jesus, who thought it not*
" *robbery*, or prey, *to be like to God:)* and if the
" things which have happened to me, have fallen

"out rather to the furtherance of the Gospel; I
"shall not think myself to have been wholly use-
"less: For though I shall ever prefer the interests
"of serious piety, charity, and practical holiness, to
"any barren speculations; and had much rather a
"man should love our Lord Jesus Christ in since-
"rity, than barely think of him just as I do; yet
"if I have also served the cause of his truth, it may
"be it is beyond what I could have done by teach-
"ing men merely what they would *have* taught
"them! Because there will never be men wanting
"to take that office, while fewer will take the part
"I have borne, to the hazard of all that the world
"counts dear and pleasant. However, as matters
"were, I had no room for an *innocent* choice, nor
"any other part than this left me, being judged
"unworthy and made incapable of all the rest!
"And if in the whole I may but approve myself to
"my great Judge, and Giver of the prize. I am not
"anxious about the applause or censure of the spec-
"tators, who shall be judged also."

AN HUMBLE INQUIRY

INTO THE

Scriptural Account of JESUS CHRIST:

OR,

A short Argument concerning his *Deity* and *Glory* according to the GOSPEL.

To us there is but one God, and he is *the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord*, viz. *Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.*—1 Cor. viii. 5.

Nec ego *Nicænam* Synodum tibi, nec tu *Ariminensem* mihi, debes objicere, Scripturarum Authoritatibus, *&c.*
Augus. cont. Maxim. l. iii. c. 14.

Thou shalt not urge me with the Council of Ariminum, *nor I thee with the Council of* Nice; *but let us decide the Cause by Scripture Authority.*

THAT the blessed Jesus has the title of *God* ascribed sometimes to him in the holy Scriptures, is not denied; but it remains to be examined in what sense that character, as given to him, is intended Nor is this an unreasonable or needless Inquiry, since it is beyond all reasonable denial, that the title of God is given in *very different* senses in the Scripture.

1. Sometimes it signifies the most High, Perfect, and Infinite Being, who is of Himself alone, and owes neither his being, nor authority, nor any thing, to another: and this is what is most commonly intended, when we speak of God in ordinary discourse and in prayer and praise; we mean it of God in the *most eminent* sense.

2. At other times it has a *lower* sense, and is made the character of persons who are invested with *subordinate* authority and power, from that Supreme Being. Thus, Angels are styled Gods, Psal. viii. 5, *thou hast made him a little lower than the Gods*, as 'tis in the margin: so magistrates are gods, Exod. xxii. 28, Ps. lxxxii. 1, John x. 34, 35. And sometimes in the singular number, one person is stiled God, as Moses is twice so called, a God to Aaron, and afterwards a God to Pharaoh[a]: and thus the Devil is called the God of this world, i. e. the Prince and mighty Ruler of it; though by unjust usurpation, and God's permission. Now as *he* who alone is God, in the former sense, is infinitely *above* all these; so we find him distinguished from all others who are called God, by this character, viz. *a God of gods*,[c] or the Chief of all gods, with whom none of those gods may be compared. So Philo describes him to be not only the *God of men*, but the *God of Gods* also. This is the highest and most glorious epithet given him in the Old Testament, when it is designed to make a most magnificent mention of his peerless greatness and glory. Equivalent to this, I take that title to be, which is so much used in the New Testament, viz. the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—the God of our Lord Jesus, the Father of glory*.[f] For since Jesus Christ is the chief of all subordinate powers, *the Prince of the kings of the earth*, and far above the greatest Angels; *the Lord of lords, and King of kings*:[h] he who is stiled the *God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, is therein, in effect, styled the *God of gods*, or above all gods.

[a] Ps. xc. 7. [b] Exod. iv. 16. [c] chap. vii. 1. [d] Deut. x. 17.
[e] Jos. xxii. 22. [f] Ps. lxxxvi. 8. [g] Ps. cxxxv. 5.
[h] Ephes. i. 3, 17. [i] Rev. i. 5. [k] Ephes. i. 12.

Now the question to be resolved is, in which of these two senses Christ is said to be God in the holy scriptures? The bare character of God determines nothing in this case, because it belongs both to the supreme and to subordinate beings in power and authority: but the question is, Whether *Jesus Christ* be the *God of gods*, or above all gods?

He is indeed the *Lord of lords*; but that denotes an inferior character, compared with that of *God of gods*, as appears by 1 Cor. viii. 5, though it be included in the superior; so that he who is above all gods, is also over all lords, but not contrariwise. In short, has Jesus Christ any God over him, who has *greater authority* and *greater ability* than himself, or not? This will decide the matter: for if he have a God *above* him, then is he *not* the absolutely Supreme God, though in relation to created beings, he may be a god (or *ruler*) over all.

Nor can we more clearly demonstrate this point, than by shewing *first*, That Jesus Christ expressly speaks of *another* God than himself. *Secondly*, That he owns this God to be *above* or *over* himself. *Thirdly*, That he wants those supereminent and infinite perfections, which belong *only* to the Lord God of Gods. Of these I shall treat in a manner suited to common capacities; for I judge it very unfit to speak or write of important articles (which the common people must believe, and must so far understand) in such a manner as leaves them wholly unintelligible.

First, Our Lord Jesus Christ expressly speaks of another God *distinct* from himself: several times we find himself saying *My God*, of another, Matt. xxvii. 46. *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* So John xx. 17; sure he intended not to say, *My Self, my Self*, why hast thou forsaken me? This God then was *distinct* from himself, as he declares in other places: *He shall know my*

doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.[l] So John viii. 42, where it is to be noted, that he does not distinguish himself from him, as the *Father*, but as *God*; and therefore, in all just construction, he cannot be supposed to be that *self-same* God, from whom he distinguishes, and to whom he opposes himself. How manifestly are the one God and the one Lord distinguished, 1 Cor. viii. 6. And that there may be no just pretence to say with Placæus, that the God and the Lord, or the cause *of* which all things are, and the cause *by* or through which they are, are but two things said of the same one God; we may see them more clearly distinguished, Eph. iv. 5, 6, where by the interposing of other things between the *one Lord* and *one God*, viz. *one faith*, *one baptism*, it appears evidently that these were *not* intended as two characters of the same Being. I think that none who impartially attends to the Scripture history, can doubt whether God and *his* Christ are not two distinct Beings.

Secondly, Our Lord Jesus owns not only *another* than himself to be God, but also that *he is above* or *over* himself, which is plainly intimated also by his apostles. Himself loudly proclaims his subjection to the Father in many instances; in general, he declares his *Father to be greater than he*:[m] he says, he came not in his *own*, but his *Father*'s name or authority; that he sought not his own, but God's glory; nor made his own will, but God's, his rule; and in such a posture of subjection *he came down from heaven*[n] into this earth: so that it should seem, *that* nature which did *pre-exist*, did not possess the Supreme will, even before it was incarnate. Again, he owns his dependence upon his God and

[l] John vii. 17. [m] xiv. 28; x. 29, 43. [n] vi. 38.
[o] v. 19, 20, 26, 27, 30.

Father, even for those things which it is pretended belong to him as God, viz. the power of working miracles, of raising the dead, of executing universal judgment; of all which he says, *Of my own self I can do nothing*.[o] In like manner his apostles declare his subjection to another, not only as his Father, but *as his God*; which is emphatically expressed in calling the most blessed God *the God of our Lord Jesus*, after his humiliation was over, Eph. i. 17, and the *Head of Christ is God*, 1 Cor. xvi. 3. They declare his headship over the universe, and the very foundations of his claim to honour and service, to be owing to the gracious *gift* of God, ἐ χαρίσαῖο ἀυτῶ; [p] and yet these are some of the highest glories of Jesus Christ.

Let me only add under this head that great text, so full of irresistible evidence for proving an *inferiority* in the Son to his Father, or to God, 1 Cor. xv. from ver. 24 to 29, where the apostle says several things to this purpose.

1. That all things are to be *put under Christ's feet*; all enemies and powers are to be subdued to him: but adds, that it is manifest *God must be excepted* out of these things that are under him; and that for this reason, because it is he *who did put all under him*. And how comes it to pass that it is so evident a thing, that *another* must be supposed to be the great author of this triumph of Christ? Why might it not be done by himself independently, if the Supreme God? and then there need have been no exception of any one *being* out of all the things under him. But the apostle knew that Jesus Christ must needs triumph by a power *derived* from God, to whom it was most eminently to be ascribed; and then to one who had such thoughts, it was manifest that there must be *one* excepted from the all things under him, because *he*

[o] John v. 19, 20. [p] Phil. ii. 9.

must needs be *above* Christ, who *enables* him to subdue all things, or *makes him a God over all.*

2. The Son shall *deliver* up *his kingdom to God*, even the *Father;* that is, not to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as some pretend, but to the *Father only;* since it was the Father who *gave him all power in heaven and earth,*[q] and who made him *King in Zion:* Into his hands he will make a *surrender* of all, in testimony of his having done all in a *subordination* to him; and having acted and ruled in *dependence* on him, and who shall have a satisfactory account of all given to him in the end. This is a glory *peculiar* to the Father, as supreme.

3. *Then the Son himself shall be subject to him that put all things under him.* i. e. to God his Father, that *God may be all in all;* that is, his subjection shall be then manifested by an open solemn acknowledgment of it, when he shall recognize the *supremacy* of the Father in that public act of *surrender:* so that, though formerly *(in the present state)* all judgment and rule were *committed* to the Son; yet then it shall be otherwise, and God will more immediately appear as supreme in the government of the future state. This then will be the issue of all our disputes; *God all in all,* and the *Son himself subject under him.* Can any thing be more expressive of an *inequality* between God and Christ?

But it will be said by some, that by the *Son* here is meant the Son of *Man,* or Christ *as Man;* while *as God,* he shall *not* be subjected to the Father.

Resp. As there is *no* intimation of any such distinction between the pretended *two* natures of the Son here; so there is enough in the words to shew, that they are spoken of him under his highest capacity and character; insomuch, that Mon-

[q] Matt. xxviii. 18.

sieur Claude maintains it to be true of the Son of God, as to his (supposed) divine nature. But though there is no need of supposing such a *nature*, (which I think the text plainly contradicts) yet his reasons will hold so far as to prove that the words do speak of Christ, under the highest character he bears, by the name of Son: for *first*, as he says, it is not said the *Son of Man*, but *the Son* absolutely, which he thinks in the scripture-use is wont to mean more than the Son of Man: and undoubtedly it imports all that comes under that title: Nay more, it is said, *even the Son himself*, with great emphasis; *q. d.* as great and glorious as he is with all his grandeur and power, he *himself* shall be *subject*. *Secondly*, his subjection being opposed to his reign, both must be understood of the same subject; surely the delivering up of the kingdom can be only done by the same to whom it was *committed*, and by whom it was managed. Now I shall allow, that only in his human nature Christ could give up his kingdom; but then it is *because* it is only as man delegated, and inhabited by God, that he sways and manages his kingdom; and if this be allowed (as I think it needs must) that the man Christ is sufficient, by help from God, to manage his universal spiritual kingdom, I see no reason there will be to oppose those *Unitarians*, who think him to be a sufficient Saviour and Prince, though he be not the only Supreme God: nor can any, with reason, attempt to prove him to be such, from his works and office as King of the Church, since it is implied, that as such he must do homage to God the Father, *in delivering up his Kingdom to him*. And this very expression, *to God the Father*, makes it plain that there is *no God the Son*, in the same sense, or in the same supreme *essence* with the Father; because if there were, then he ought not be excluded from his glory of having such open

homage paid to him, which is here appropriated to the Father only. And since the Apostle speaks of the same God (whom he explains to be the Father) to the end of this discourse, and says *he* shall *be all in all;* how evidently does he shew him to be far beyond all that are *not* God the Father, whatever character else they bear! So then Jesus Christ, in his highest capacity, being *inferior* to the Father; how can he be the *same* God, to which he is *subject;* or of the *same* rank and dignity?

Thus it appears that Christ is *so* God, as to be *under* a superior God, who has *set* him over all: And suitable to this is that account which the scripture gives us of the Godhead of the blessed Jesus, *viz.* because he is *invested* with a godlike authority and power from the *Supreme God* his Father. Thus when he was accused by the captious Jews for assuming the character of the Son of God (which they perversely would stretch,[r] as though it implied an equality with God) he explains in what sense only he justified it, *viz.* as one whom the Father had *sanctified, i. e. called* to a greater office, and *honoured* with a higher commission than those magistrates on whom the scripture so freely bestows the title of *Gods.*[s] So when he is called God, it is explained in what sense, or what sort of God. It is to be understood, by saying, that *his* God (intimating that he had a *God* over him) had *anointed him with oil,* &c. that is, had *invested* him with royal power and dignity, (as kings were installed in their office, by anointing with oil, among the Jews) which is an explication of his godhead or dominion. And this is said to be *above all his fellows,* not surely above the Father and Holy Spirit, (which only are pretended to be his fellows, as God, by them who understand it of the Supreme Godhead) but above all *other subordinate*

[r] John x. 35, 36.

beings. This is one plain scripture-account of his being called God; for these things are spoken to him and of him under the character of God, *O God, thy throne*, &c. I think men should be well assured on what grounds they go, before they assign other reasons of this character, so different from the scripture-account :[t] let it suffice us, that God hath *made him both Lord and Christ*; that he has *exalted him to be a Prince and Saviour*.[u]

However, our adversaries will gain nothing by alleging texts to prove that the title of God is given to Christ, since that may be; and yet it will not prove him to be the *Supreme and Independent* God, but only one who is inhabited of, and *commissioned* and *enabled* by him who is so. As to that place, which is corruptly rendered in our translation, *he thought it no robbery to be equal to God*[w]; it is confessed by our adversaries themselves, that it should be read thus, *viz.* he did not *assume*, or *arrogate* or *covet*, an equality with God: the words are never known to be used in any other sense, as is shewn by Dr. Tillotson in his discourses against the Socinians; also by Dr. Whitby in his exposition on that place; and others. So that this rather *denies* than asserts Christ's equality to God; though still he was in the *form of God*, as that denotes the outward *resemblance* of him in his mighty power and works, *&c.* which is the constant meaning of the word *form* in the New Testament.

But because some think such perfections are in scripture ascribed to Christ, as will prove him to be God in the highest sense, I proceed to shew;

Thirdly, That our blessed Lord Jesus *disclaims* those infinite perfections which belong only to the Supreme *God of Gods*. And it is most certain, that if he want one or any of these perfections that are essential to the Deity, he is not God in the *chief*

[t] Acts ii. 36. [u] Ib. v. 31. [w] Phil. ii. 6.

sense: and if we find him disclaiming the *one*, he cannot challenge the *other;* for to deny himself to have *all* divine perfections, or to deny himself to be the *infinite* God, is the same thing. Let us observe some instances for the proof of this point.

1. One great and peculiar perfection of the Deity is absolute *underived* omnipotence: He who cannot work all miracles, and do whatever he list of *himself*, without help from another, can never be the Supreme Being, or God; because he appears to be an imperfect, defective Being, comparatively, since he needs help, and can receive *additional* strength from another.

Now it is more evident, that our Lord Jesus (whatever power he had) confesses again and again, that he had not *infinite* power of himself; *of myself I can do nothing.*[x] He had been speaking of great miracles, *viz.* raising the dead, and executing all judgment; but all along takes care, men should know that his *sufficiency* for these things was of God the Father. In the beginning of the discourse he says, *the Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father do:*[y] so in the middle, *the Father has given to the Son to have life in himself:*[z] and as if he could never too much inculcate this great truth, he adds towards the conclusion, *I can do nothing of myself*, ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ; or, from nothing that is my *self* do I draw this power and authority. Surely this is not the *voice* of God, but of a dependent Being! For the most High can receive from none; he cannot be made more mighty or wise, &c. because to absolute perfection can be *no addition.*[a] And since power in God is an essential perfection; it follows, that if it be *derived*, then so is the essence or being itself: which is a kind of blasphemy against the most High, for it is to *un-God* him, to number him among dependent derivative beings;

[x] John v. 30. [y] Ver. 19. [z] Ver. 26. 27. [a] Rom. xi. 35.

whilst the Supreme God *indeed* is only he who is the *first cause* and absolute original of all.

Nay, further, our Lord considers himself here, in opposition to his *Father*, who, he says, *gave* him all power. Now if he had such an *eternal* divine *word*, united more nearly to him than the *Father*; surely he would have owned his power to be from that *word* or divine *Son*.

How comes he to ascribe nothing to that, since it is supposed to be equal in power to the Father himself, and more nearly allied to Jesus Christ, as the operating principle in him? *My Father in me does the works*; by which it is evident there was no divine agent in and with him, but the Father: He *only* has all power of himself, and needs no assistance.

2. Another infinite perfection that must needs be in the Deity, is supreme absolute goodness: *All nations* have consented to this by the light of nature; that ἄγαθον *et optimus maximus*, are the prime characters of the *Supreme*: as the orator says, he is one, *quo nec melius nec majus concipi potest*; the fullest and highest of all that are *good*: for indeed all other good is derived from him.

Now the Lord Jesus expressly *disclaims* this character: *Jesus said to him, why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, and that is God*:[c] where it is most evident that he *distinguishes* himself from God, as not the *same* with him, and *denies* of himself, what he *affirms* of God: And as to that divine perfection of supreme infinite *goodness*, he challenges the man for presuming to say what seemed to attribute it to him, and leads him off to *another*, who, and who *only* was more eminently so.

3. I will only add one perfection more, viz. *absolute omniscience*, or unlimited knowledge of all things, *past, present, and to come*. Ps. cxlvii. 5, *His*

[b] John xiv. 10. [c] Matt. xix. 17.

understanding is infinite. So Isa. xli. 23. Acts xv. 18, *Known to God are all his works from the beginning.*

Now, it is plain our Lord Jesus Christ had *not* this infinite knowledge, particularly not of *future* things, such as the day of judgment. Mark xiii. 32, says he, *of that day knows no man, no, not the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only.* Here the *Son* professes his knowledge to be *limited*, and *inferior* to the Father's. Now how is it possible the *Son* can be God infinite, and yet have but a finite understanding? or can be equal in knowledge to the Father, and yet not know as much as the Father? And surely if he was not an infinite God, when on earth, he cannot be such afterwards. Thus we have seen Christ himself, with his own mouth, *disclaiming* infinite original power, goodness, and knowledge to belong to him; but he attributes them to his Father *only*, as another distinct from himself, from whom he derived of each in a dependent limited manner.

What can be said against these plain arguments? I imagine our opposers have but one plea left for evading them, and that is a distinction which serves them in all cases; for *they say*, Jesus Christ speaks these things of himself as *man only*, while he had another nature as *God*, which he reserved and excepted out of the case. So that when he says, *I cannot* do thus of myself, or I am not to be called the *chief* good; or do not *know* this, &c. according to *them*, the meaning is, I have not these perfections in my *human nature*, but I know and can do all unassisted, and am the chief good in my *divine nature*, which also is more properly *myself*. The vanity of this subterfuge I intend now to lay open, by shewing how absurdly this distinction of the *two natures* is pretended, to take off the force of such expressions from Christ's own mouth, which

in their natural and undisguised appearance do proclaim his *inferiority* to God, even the Father. And I shall dwell the more upon this, because it is the most popular and common evasion, and comes in at every turn, when all other relief fails.

It would be no unreasonable demand to ask, what intimation of any such *distinction* of two natures they can point us to in any of these discourses of Christ? Why should men devise or imagine for him such a strange and seemingly deceitful way of speaking, from no ground, or necessity, other than that of upholding their own precarious opinion? But I have several remarks upon this common answer.

That which in the *first* place I have to object against it is, that our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, if *himself* was the Supreme God in any nature of his *own*, could not have said such things, as I conceive, in any consistency with *truth* and *sincerity;* he could not say himself could *not* do, or did *not* know, the thing—which all this while *himself* could *do*, and *did* know very well; as surely if he was the Supreme God, he could and did; for this were to make him say what is most *false*, and to *equivocate* in the most *deceitful* manner. Though we should suppose he consisted of two infinitely distant natures, and so had two capacities of knowledge, &c. yet since *himself* includes them both, it follows, that the *denying* a thing of himself, in absolute terms, without any limitation in the words, or other obvious circumstances, does plainly imply a denial of its belonging to any part of his person, or to any nature in it. Again; though we may affirm a thing of a person, which belongs *only* to a part of him; as I may properly say a man is wounded or hurt, though it be only in one member, suppose an arm: yet I cannot justly deny a thing of him which belongs only to one part, because it belongs not to

another; as I cannot say a man is *not* wounded, because though one arm *be* wounded, the other is whole.

For instance, I have two organs of sight, *two eyes*. Now suppose I converse with a man who has one eye shut, and the other open; if being asked whether I saw him, I should dare to say I saw him not (without any limitation) meaning to myself, that I saw him not with the eye which was shut, though still I saw him with the eye which was open; I fear I should bear the reproach of a liar and *deceiver*, notwithstanding such a mental reservation as some would attribute to the *Holy Jesus*. For knowledge is the *eye* of the person; Jesus Christ is supposed to have two of these knowing capacities; the *one* weak, the *other* strong and piercing, which discerns all things. Now as *such* an one, the disciples repair to him, and ask him,[d] When the end of the world, and time of his coming shall be? He answers them, by giving them some general account of the matter, but says that the particular *day and hour* he knew not, nor did any know but the Father, *meaning* (say my opposers) that he knew it not with his *human* knowledge, though he knew it well enough with his *divine*, at the same time that he said *the Son knows it not*, absolutely and indefinitely.

If Jesus Christ had a *divine* knowledge and nature, no doubt his disciples (who, above all others, must be supposed to believe *it*) directed the question to *that*, rather than to the imperfect *human* capacity; and yet our Lord in his answer says, he *knew not the day*; which would not be counted sincerity or truth in *men*, much less was *Jesus Christ* capable of the contrary; in his mouth was *no guile*; let *us* not *impute* it to him!

That you may see this is fair reasoning, hear how some of the other side own it, when out of

[d] Matt. xxiv. 3.

the heat of this controversy. See Dr. Stillinfleet's sermon on Matt. x. 16; speaking of the equivocations of Popish priests, whose common answer, when examined about what they have known by confession, is, that they *know it not*, which they think to vindicate from the charge of lying by saying, that *in confession the Priest knows matters as God, not as man; therefore he denies as man.* But, says the Doctor, this is absurd; because to say he does not know, is as much as to say he does not *any way know*. Now if this be a good answer against the Papists, as no doubt it is, then surely it is so in the present case. Therefore, when Christ says *he knows not the day of judgment*, it is as much as to say he does not *any way* know it; and consequently, it is a vain shift for any to say it was as *man* only. We must beware lest we bring the holy Jesus under such a reproach for equivocation, as the Romish Priests lie under; and make the Jesuits themselves think they have a good title to that *name*, by imitating herein *his* example, which in this very instance they allege with so great advantage according to this interpretation.

2. As a farther evidence that Jesus Christ intended no such distinction of two natures, it is to be observed, that he puts not the *distinction* or opposition between the Son of *Man*, and the eternal *word*, (as some speak) but between the *Son* and his *Father*.[e] *The Son knows not, but only the Father*; by which, it is plain, he had no thought of including any person or nature of his own among the excepted; for whatever was not the *Father*, he says, was ignorant of that day. Now it is certain, that in *no nature* was the Son the Father; and consequently where *none* but the Father knows, none who is *not* the Father can be intended: and since our Lord was making an exception in the case, he

[e] Mark xiii. 32.

would not have forgotten to except the eternal *word* too, if there had been such a divine principle in himself, *equal* to the Father, and distinct from him; for it is a known *rule*, that an exception from a general assertion confirms it as to no other instances not excepted.

Will they say, that by the *Father* is meant all three persons here, viz. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? What! can the *Father*, as opposed to the Son, be put for the Father *and* the Son? What woful work will this make with scripture, to suppose that what are *opposed* to each other *include* each other, under the very character by which they are opposed? As well may they say, that in the baptismal form by the *Father* is meant Father, Son, and Spirit, though he be distinguished from the other two. And I should despair of ever understanding the scriptures, above all books that ever were written, at this rate of interpretation. No doubt, therefore, but the *Father* as *opposed* to the *Son* excludes all that is the *Son*; and then there could be no Son of God that knew of that day which only the *Father* knew of, and consequently no Son that is God *equal* to the Father.

3. Moreover, that interpretation must needs be unjust, which, if admitted, will make all, even in the most plain speech, *uncertain* and utterly insignificant; as this interpretation of Christ's words would do. For, as I ask the patrons of this opinion, in what words Jesus Christ could *in brief* have denied himself to be God most High, if he had chosen to do it, more plain and full than these? in which he says, he knew *not* all things as the Father *did*; nor could do all things, &c. So I would fain have them shew me, what words of that nature he could have used, which the *same way* of interpretation, as they here use, will not *evade* and make insignificant. For had he said, in plain words, thus,

viz. *I tell you I am not the Supreme God,* and none but *my Father* has that glory; they would upon the *same reason* still have said, this was to be understood of him as *man* only. So that no words professing himself *not* to be God, could be a proof of it, if this way of interpretation be allowed. I may therefore safely say thus much—that the Blessed Jesus *has* declared himself *not* to be the Supreme God, or equal to the *Father,* as plainly as words could speak or in brief express; and that this declaration made by him already is not to be evaded any *other way,* than what will make it impossible his mind should be understood by any words he could have designedly used in the matter. Let any one try if this do not hold true: and sure it must be an absurd way of interpretation, which leaves a person no opportunity, or power, of speaking his meaning *plainly,* so as to be understood.

4. Again this way of interpretation, which the advocates of the opinion I oppose are so much necessitated to for upholding their cause, does plainly overthrow it again, and may be turned against themselves: for if it be just and true to deny of Christ, absolutely, what belongs to him in one nature, because there is another nature in which it belongs *not* to him; *then,* since to be the chief God belongs to him (according to our adversaries) only in *one nature,* and not in respect to the other, or human nature, it follows that it may as justly be said Jesus Christ is not God, nor to be *worshipped* or trusted as such; nay, that he was not before the *Virgin Mary,* according to them, and the like; and this without adding any limitation or restriction, any more than our Lord does in the place mentioned.

What would they say to one who should speak or preach so, *that Christ is not God,* that he cannot do all things, nor is equal to the Father, &c.? Would they not conclude he was a denier

of the Deity of Christ, else he would never speak so unguardedly? Upon the *same* account, when Jesus Christ himself says, that he cannot of *himself* do all things, nor knows all things, and makes no reserve in his words, we may conclude he also *denies* his being Supreme God; *else*, if it be a just way of speaking in him, it cannot be unjust in us to imitate him, by denying him indefinitely to be, what he in any one nature is not, *i. e.* that he is *not God*, without adding more.

Nay, after this way of speaking which they attribute to Christ, a man may be taught to say his creed *backward*, and yet make a true profession of his faith, by denying of Jesus Christ in absolute expressions whatever may be denied of one of his natures. Thus since the *Apostle's Creed* takes notice of nothing to be believed concerning Christ, but what belongs to his *manhood*, (which is strange, if there were any articles relating to his Supreme Deity, which must be most important) one may venture to deny them all, with this *secret* unexpressed reserve, *viz.* meaning it of the *divine nature*, to which they belong not. So that one may say, I believe not Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, or *born* of the Virgin Mary; I believe that he never was crucified under Pontius Pilate, nor was dead or buried; that he never *rose* or ascended, or will *return* visibly again: for his *divine* nature (which it is professed he had) was not capable of these things. And since they say the personality is divine, here seems more warrant to be bolder in denying indefinitely of the person what belongs not to the *divine* nature, whose the *personality* is, than in so denying of the person what only belongs not to the *human* nature, as this interpretation makes Christ to do.

5. Finally, it weighs something with me, in opposition to this way of interpretation, that the

Evangelists never take any occasion (when they had so many) to subjoin any *caution* against taking Christ's words in their obvious sense, when he says, *he did not know the hour*, &c. and the like. If, as we said, our Lord had no mind to reveal his divinity, (though I see not still why he should deny it thus) yet sure his Apostles who wrote so many years after, whom it concerned to reveal all important truths most clearly, would not fail to have set the reader right, by removing such obvious objections as these are against the Supreme Deity of Christ; and saying, he spake only in respect of his *manhood*, *that he knew not all things*, &c. But here is not one caution given, however often we find there was about less matters.[f] No doubt it was because they would have the thing understood as it fairly lies, not thinking of any such secret reserve in Christ, of a *divine nature* in his person, to be *tacitly excepted*, when he *denied* such perfections of his person *indefinitely*.

Thus it remains good, that Jesus Christ *disclaims* infinite perfections to belong to him as to the Father; and therefore that he is *not* the same *infinite God* with him, if we can believe his own words. But before I conclude this argument, I shall endeavour to answer what our opposers offer on the *contrary* side: they say there is abundant evidence from other scriptures, that Jesus Christ *has* those perfections in him, which I have shewed in the fore-mentioned places he *denies* of himself. These they lay in *balance* to the other; and since *both* sides cannot be proved, it must be examined, which ought to yield. Particularly they say, *omniscience* is ascribed to Jesus Christ, even such as is peculiar to the Supreme God; and since this indeed is that infinite perfection which they seem to allege the most plausible testimonies for its belonging to

[f] John ii. 2; xi. 15.

him, I choose to single out this in particular. I think I have made good the *negative* already from his own mouth, that he did *not* know all things; Nor can any thing of equal evidence and force be produced for the affirmative, as will appear upon considerate examination.

The instances usually alleged to prove the infinite *omniscience* of Jesus Christ, are either, 1. Such as speak of his knowing *all* things in general; or, 2. Of his knowing men's thoughts and *hearts* in particular. To both which I reply:

First, It is objected, that the disciples ascribe to him the knowledge of all things, as John xvi. 30; xxi. 17, *Thou knowest all things.* I answer, that as those expressions are words of admiration from the disciples *not yet inspired;* so they are intended only to express a very great and comprehensive knowledge, far from infinite divine *omniscience:* as appears,

1. By Christ's own words; he knew not what the Father knew, viz. the particular time of the day of judgment.

2. In that it was common to ascribe all knowledge to men of extraordinary wisdom, especially when any intended to commend them highly, and were affected with wonder; for admiration and praise naturally inclines to run out into *hyperboles.* Thus the woman of Tekoah, under a surprising wonder of David's sagacity, cries out, *My Lord knows all things on earth, and is as wise as an Angel.*[g] And the Apostle in commendation of some Christians says, *they know all things.*[h] And yet it is plain such encomiums must have their limitations. And indeed the Jews seem to have thought their prophets knew, in a manner, *all things:* Thus when a woman of ill fame anointed our Lord's head, the Pharisee says of him, *if this man were a pro-*

[h] 1 John ii. 20, 27. [g] Luke vii. 39

phet, he would know what manner of woman that is.[i] And when the woman of Samaria found that he told her of all her secret acts that ever she did, she concludes thus, *Sir, I perceive* thou art a *prophet.*[k] It is no wonder, then, if the disciples speak thus of him, *thou knowest all things,* without esteeming him more than the greatest of prophets.

3. It is evident they never intended more, by attributing *all knowledge* to him, from their own words in one of the texts, mentioned John xvi. 30; where the disciples tell us, how much they inferred from his great knowledge, (which they describe and extol, by saying, thou knowest all things) not that he *was* God, but one *sent* of God: *by this we believe that thou camest forth from God;* not that thou thyself art that God. So that by these large expressions, they only intend to attribute to him what a *created* being is, by divine assistance, capable of; and therefore it is violence to their words, to infer from them that Jesus Christ is *God;* when they themselves, who best knew their own meaning, infer no such thing.

And yet if it were granted that our Lord Jesus knows all things, *i. e.* which actually are; yet if he know not all *futurities* too, which he himself denies, he comes short of infinite omniscience. For aught I know, a finite being may have a knowledge commensurate to this poor earth, which is but *a dust of the balance;* and yet not know all God's secret purposes, or the seasons which the Father keeps in his own hand, Acts i. 7.

Secondly, it is objected, that the knowledge of the heart is ascribed to Christ, John ii. 25; Mat. ix. 9; but especially Rev. ii. 23. And this, they say, is what belongs to God only, as Solomon judges, 1 Kings viii. 39; and God claims it as his eminent glory, Jer. xvii. 10; and yet *Jesus Christ* says, *I am*

[i] 2 Sam. xiv. 20. [k] John iv. 19.

he who searches the heart; therefore, say they, surely he must be that God, *who only knows the hearts of all the children of men.* I take this to be the strongest instance that can be produced, from the sacred text, for proving any *infinite* divine perfections to belong to the Lord Jesus Christ, and it shall be seriously considered.

In answer hereto, I shall shew *two* things. 1. In what sense the searching and knowing the heart is made peculiar to God, and incommunicable to others, by those texts. 2. That notwithstanding it be peculiar to Him in some sense, yet these acts may in another sense be justly attributed to another, and performed by him who is *not* the most High God.

1. As to the former, though Solomon says, *thou, Lord, only knowest the hearts of all men;* yet what if I say, it is no wonder that Solomon should not know of any other to whom that excellency was communicated, since this mystery of the unsearchable riches and fulness of Christ, and of God's being *manifest* in his flesh, and his high exaltation of him, was hidden in the ages past, and only manifested in the times of the gospel? Yet, I add, such expressions in scripture, appropriating some perfections to God, do only import that God has *no equal* herein; or that there is an *eminent* sense only in which such perfections are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to all others; though still, in a lower sense, something of them may be communicated by him to others. And this shall be seen to be no forced supposition, but according to the current strain of plain scripture in a multitude of instances. Thus it is said, that *God only is wise,* Rom. xvi. 27; 1Tim. i. 17: So, ch. vi. 16; *God only has immortality.* So, thou *only* art *holy,* Rev. xv. 4. And yet there are wise and holy men; and immortal, holy angels and spirits. But the

meaning of those appropriate expressions is, that the blessed God is wise, and holy, and immortal, in a *more excellent* way, and *higher* sense, than all others, and in which sense others *cannot* be so. So when it is said, God only knows the hearts of men, it must be interpreted in the same way, viz. That there is none can know the heart *as God does*, so universally, so immediately and independently; and yet it is no contradiction to say, that he *enables* another to do it in great measure *under* him. And as he would argue but very weakly, who should go about to prove an angel to be God from this, that he is called *holy* and *wise*, &c. which are said to belong to *God only;* even so in the same manner must they argue, who would prove Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God, from his knowing men's hearts, because that is said to belong to God only; except they can shew that Jesus Christ knows in the same excellent independent manner as his Father, and that he is no more beholden to him for ability and assistance, than the Father is to his Son *Jesus Christ*. So I might argue from Isaiah xlvi. 9, that God only knows *futurities;* and yet how often have the *prophets* foretold them from him!

And it is not hard to suppose, that as holiness and wisdom, so to know the thoughts and hearts of men, hath been communicated to prophets and apostles. Was there not something of this, if not in the prophet Elisha's telling the secret counsels of the *Syrian* king, 2 Kings vi. 12, yet at least in the *spirit of discerning* mentioned 1 Cor. xii. 10.; and in the case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira?*[1] I grant this was by Divine *assistance* of the Spirit of God, and by revelation. Neither is our Lord *Jesus Christ* ashamed to own that his knowledge is sometimes owing to *revelation from God his Father*, Rev. i. 1. If any should ask, how Jesus Christ

[1] Acts v.

comes to know all that he reveals in those seven Epistles to the seven Churches, &c. the very *first* words of that Book of the Revelations may be an answer; *it was the revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ*, &c. No wonder then that he says, he knows their works, their hearts, and their approaching judgments and trials, when his own vast abilities are assisted by God's revelation!

But it will be said, that his *searching the heart* imports it to be his own act.

Answer; So it may very well be; for whatever even a *man* knows, he knows it by his own act. And why may not the *mind* search, and yet be under the light of revelation, and the influence of *superior* assistance? But yet after all, these words of searching the heart are only an expression that denotes the *accuracy* of his knowledge, not the *manner* of attaining to it; for taken *properly*, as applied to God, it is dishonourable to say, he is put to make a *search*, since all things are naked and open to his view. And if they must be taken *strictly* and properly, as applied to Christ, then they belong not to him in the *same* sense as they do to God; and so can be no argument of his being that God: Which leads me to shew,

2. That there is no absurdity in attributing *this* knowledge of the heart to *Jesus Christ*, though he be *not* the most High God. That he knows things with some limitation as to the *degree*, and in dependence on his Father as to the *manner*, appears by what has been said already. And therefore the knowledge of the heart attributed to him must be such as is consistent with his *subordination* to the Father's *greater* knowledge.

'Tis pleaded, that it is not possible for a *finite* being to have such universal knowledge of the hearts and ways of men, as is ascribed to Jesus Christ; and which, as *Head* and Ruler of the church and

world, he ought to have; and therefore he is *infinite* God.

Answer; I am pretty sure it can never be demonstrated, that it exceeds a finite capacity to know the concerns of all on this earth, when the enlarged understanding is assisted in the *highest* manner by Divine influence and revelation. The reason is, because the *object* is *finite;* and I challenge any man to shew me how it can be impossible for a finite capacity to comprehend a finite object, as this world is, and would be, though it were ten thousand times greater than it is! I am satisfied this can *never* be demonstrated to imply any contradiction; and that all such imaginations concerning it proceed chiefly from too high a conceit of man, and too low an apprehension of the infinite God; as if the distance between these two were *so small*, that there could not be one made of a capacity so much above men, as to be commensurate to them all, but that presently he must be the most High God! As though that Supreme Being could not produce one who should be a thousand times *beyond* all this earth and its inhabitants, and yet be infinitely *below* himself!—Methinks, if the *sun* were but an intelligent creature, and could diffuse his intellectual influences as he does his natural; could but see and understand with his beams and secret influences; it is easy to imagine what a penetrating and comprehensive knowledge he might have! But we may entertain much greater thoughts of the *Sun of Righteousness, Jesus Christ!*

And I conceive a strong argument to prove Jesus Christ as man (so made) capable of such deep and extensive knowledge, may be drawn from the offices of dignity and power *conferred* on him by God: for God has *given to him to be Head over all things.*[k] *He has given or committed to him all*

[k] Eph. i. 22.

judgment;[l] and that as the *Son of Man.*[m] In short his kingly office, by which he rules over all the world, and takes special care of all his members, as it necessarily supposes his knowledge of the whole estate of his church and every member of it, as far as is necessary for the discharge of that *trust*; so I think it undeniably proves this large knowledge to be exercised by him as *man*, however he gain it.

For since this office and power are given, they cannot *terminate* in the divine nature; for who can *give* to God any dignity or power, who has all *originally* in his own being? It must then be given to the *man*, or created nature only: and if the man Christ Jesus sustain this office, and be invested with this kingly power, even with all power in heaven and earth; then *as man* we cannot deny him to be suitably qualified for it with all requisite abilities, lest we reproach *God*, as calling one to an employment, who is not fitted for it; or *Himself*, in assuming a trust which he is not able to discharge. Besides, unless his human nature can execute this power, it cannot be said to be *given* to it; for a power which cannot be exerted, or is impossible to be executed, is not *given* or *received;* any more than a commission or grant to a stock or a tree, to bear rule, not over the other trees, (as in *Jotham's* apologue) but over a nation, or to command an army: it is no gift at all, if this were the case, that the *man* Christ Jesus be utterly *incapable* of the office and government lodged in him.

If it be said, that though the office and delegated authority be *committed* to the *human*, yet it is only *executed* by the *divine* nature, in Christ: I *answer*, it is most unreasonable to suppose this *trust* committed to the man Christ, who must at last *deliver* it up;[n] and yet the management of it belong only

[l] John v. 22. [m] Ver. 27. [n] 1 Cor. xv. 24.

to another Being! How can *he* be commended for being *faithful over the house of God, to him who appointed or constituted him*,*—when it is not expected he should execute his office?—I grant, indeed, that his *kingly office* is executed by the assistance of God, as he exerts his divine power and wisdom, through the human nature of Christ, and communicates of them in *all fulness* to him, in whom it dwells; but to say, that the man Christ does not exercise his kingly universal power, but that his divine nature (supposing it) does solely and immediately execute the office given to him as *man*, or Mediator, (for *to God can nothing be given*) is in my mind a most gross absurdity! It is to say, that God officiates for man, in execution of a *delegated* or subordinate authority; or that he acts under the authority and in the name of a creature, which is not meet to be said of the Supreme God.—*It remains*, therefore, that as Christ's universal kingdom and headship is by *gift from God* (of which only the *man* Christ is the receiver) committed as a *trust* to him; so he certainly wants no ability to *execute* that trust, in the *nature* entrusted with it: I say, no ability, whether of power or knowledge, sufficient to render him a careful, vigorous, and every way most *effectual Head* of his body, and *ruler* of the world; and to deny this, is to *rob* him of his greatest glory.

Besides, - What benefit or *gift* is it to the man Christ, that the Divine nature should execute a power which it *always* had, and could exercise without any gift to him?—What reward, or what addition, was this to him?

Another *argument* may be drawn from that comfortable ground of confidence in a *Christian's* address to God, which the scripture lays down, viz. the sympathizing compassion of our Lord Jesus

* Heb. iii. 2, 6.

Christ towards his distressed servants, arising from his own sufferings when on earth: *Seeing we have not an high priest, who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted as we are; let us therefore come boldly to to the throne of grace.*[p] Christ's having been tried with sufferings makes him a more compassionate earnest advocate for us; and this is our comfort.

Now it is certain, this compassion arising from his own experience of trouble can belong to none but his *human* nature; the *divine* nature is compassionate, but not for this reason, *because* it was *tempted* or *grieved* with misery: No, it was only the man Christ suffered, and consequently feels a *sympathy* from hence with his distressed servants. And it is most certain, that if he sympathize with them in their troubles, he must then know them in *that nature*, which only has a *fellow-feeling* of them; for none can sympathize with the miseries of others which he knows not of: so that they who deny Christ's human nature to be capable of the knowledge of all our miseries, do in effect deny him to be such a *compassionate* advocate as the scripture represents him, and rob us of this strong ground of consolation and hope in our approaches to God, which the *Apostle* would have us to build on.

And this doctrine has been so far from appearing either impossible or *absurd* to the reason of mankind, that I might produce the consent of a very great number of learned men, even among them who oppose my other opinions. The *Lutherans* allow the man Christ a sort of universal knowledge, as well as universal presence, which they plead for. The school-men, both *Thomists* and *Scotists*, allow him universal knowledge, though they differ in their way of explaining it.

[p] Heb. iv. 15, 16.

And there was a time in the sixth century, when in the Christian church some were branded with *heresy*, under the name of *Agnoetæ*, who held Christ was ignorant of any thing; which I conceive must have been in relation to his *human* nature; for those persons owned him to have a *divine nature*, and it is hard to imagine they could attribute ignorance to that! But (waving that matter, which is disputed) it is enough for my purpose, viz. to prove what sense the Christian Church then had of Christ's *extensive* knowledge as *man*; that they who wrote against those *hereticks*, do expresly deny any ignorance in Christ as *Man*. For this we may produce *two* famous *patriarchs* of the Christian Church at that time, *viz. Eulogius* of *Alexandria*, and *Gregory* of *Rome*: those hereticks produced for their opinion Christ's words, that he knew not the time of the last judgment, as an instance of his ignorance. To this the *former* person says, that he was not ignorant of it, *not as man, and much less as God*. The *latter* says, *In natura quidem humanitatis novisse, sed non ex natura humanitatis*: He knew it with the human nature, but that knowledge did not rise from the humanity;—which is what I maintain as to the knowledge I attribute to him, but not extending it so far as to all *futurities*, which they did.

And I find not a few of the modern *reformed divines*, who (when out of this dispute) speak agreeably to this, and are far from thinking it idolatry to ascribe as much knowledge as I have done to the *man* Christ. Thus Mr. Baxter, in his notes on Ephes. iv. 16, plainly intimates, that he conceives an *Angel* might be made capable of ruling the *universal* church on earth by legislation, judgment, and execution; for, having said this task was impossible to any power but *Divine*, he corrects himself by adding, *or angelical at least*;—

and sure the *man* Christ's ability is far superior to angels; besides that he has them ministering to him, and giving him notice of matters if there be any occasion; for he has seven principal Spirits, who are the *eyes of the Lamb sent forth through all the earth*, as the *same* author interprets, Rev. v. 6.

So the author of the little book, called *The Future State*, the same who wrote the *Good Samaritan*, a worthy divine of the Church of England, says many things very rationally concerning the probably large extent of Christ's human knowledge; that *He can as easily inspect the whole globe of this earth, and the heavens that compass it, as we can view a globe of an inch diameter:* p. 46, 47. *That he intercedes as man; and can he intercede in a case which he knows not?* So again, p. 150. The like, says Limborch, in his *Theol. Christ.* lib. v. c. 18.

Let me add only the testimony of Dr. *Thomas Goodwin*, who was never, I suppose, censured for an *idolater* among *Dissenters;* and yet it is scarce possible that I should attribute greater knowledge to the *man* Jesus Christ than he. See his *Select Cases*, Part III. where he says, The *human understanding of Christ takes in all occurrenees which concern his church. And that as he said, All power in heaven and earth is given me of my Father; so might he say, All knowledge in heaven and earth is given me; that his beams pierce into every corner, that he knows the sore of every heart*: And concludes with these remarkable words, *That as a looking-glass wrought in the form of a globe, represents the images of all that is in the room, so the enlarged human understanding of Christ takes in all things in heaven and earth at once!* It seems these men did not take it to be the peculiar perfection of the divine nature to know the *hearts*,

so as that no creature could partake of it by *divine assistance* and *revelation*.

Indeed, as to the manner of knowing the heart, we cannot tell how the inhabitants of the other world have access to our minds, or to each other's; but without doubt *Jesus Christ*, whose eyes are as a *flame of fire*, has more proper abilities for penetration, as well as more revelation from God, and more capacity for receiving and treasuring it up, than all others. In short, it is evident, Christ as *man* is the great *administrator* of God's *providential* kingdom;[q] as *man* he must judge the whole world,[r] which implies vast and *universal* knowledge. Who then dares say, that the *man* Christ Jesus has not a knowledge as large as this narrow earth; or *as the sand by the sea-shore*, without any *hyperbole*? I think it is beyond all reasonable doubt: and as this doctrine has appeared rational enough, and escaped all censure, as far as I know, when delivered by others than the *Unitarians*; so I hope that must not be counted *heretical* in them, for which others never forfeited the glorious title of *Orthodox*.

Thus it appears, that all which is said of Christ's extensive knowledge in scripture, is far from proving him to be the Supreme *Infinite* God; it may be accounted for *otherwise* very fairly: And the like may be also said with respect to other (which some call) *divine* perfections attributed to him, that they are no more *truly* infinite, as attributed to him, than this of knowledge; but that there are plain evidences of their being attributed to him in a *limited* and *inferior* sense, in comparison of what *they* are, in the most glorious *God over all Gods*:—And therefore men had need produce other sort of argument for the *Supreme Deity* of Christ, than from these topics.

[q] John v. 27. [r] Acts xvii. 31.

Nor do I doubt but I could maintain my cause with equal advantage, upon the head of *divine worship*, which is another *topic*, whence my opposers would infer the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. It were easy to shew, there is no *instance* of supreme divine worship given *ultimately* to him in scripture; but on the *contrary*, that all the honour it assigns to him is such as speaks him to be *inferior* to the Father, and *dependent* on him; since it is wholly grounded upon what God, *his* Father, has graciously *bestowed* on him. Thus he requires *baptism* (if that be an act of immediate proper worship) *in his name*, because *all power* in heaven and earth was *given to him*. Thus we must honour the *Son* as (*truly*, not as *greatly* as) we honour the *Father*; because the *Father hath committed, or given, all judgment to him.*[s] Thus at *the name of Jesus must every knee bow, and everytongue confess him to be Lord;*[t] because as a reward of his obedience, the Father *hath given him a name above every name:* and it is added, that all this homage is *ultimately* to the *glory of the Father*. Worship which is thus grounded upon *derived* and *borrowed* excellency, is not supremely divine; and cannot be offered to the infinite, self-originate, independent *Deity*, without a great affront,—because it is not the most excellent, Mal. i. 14. To praise an independent God for honour and power *granted* to him by *another*, supposes a falshood, and mingles reproaches with praise!

So that, however there may be the same common *external* acts or words (such as bowing the knee, and saying *glory and praise, &c.*) used to God and the *Mediator;* as also in some instances they are given in common to *ordinary* men; yet the mind of a rational worshipper will make a distinction in his inward *intention*, as no doubt but those de-

[s] John v. 22, 23. [t] Phil. ii. 10.

vout *Jews* did, who in the same act *bowed their heads, and worshipped both God and the King.*[u] But I shall not pursue this any farther at present.

Moreover, I judge, that to assert Jesus Christ to be the *Supreme* God subverts the gospel-doctrine of his *mediation;* for if I must have one who is *Supreme God and man*, for my mediator with God, then, when I address to Jesus Christ as the Supreme God, where is the *God-man* that must be my Mediator with him? To say he mediates with *himself* is the same as to say, that I must go to him without a Mediator; and turns the whole business of mediation into a *metaphor*, contrary to the common sense of things, as well as against the *scripture:* and I would gladly know what is the notion of going to God without a Mediator, if this be all, that he mediates with himself? Who ever doubted the exercise of his own *wisdom* or *mercy*, that these do in a sort plead in him? But surely the scriptures speak of a Mediator without him, when they set forth Jesus Christ as such; and who is this *Mediator*, when we go to Jesus Christ as the *ultimate* object? If it be said *his human nature only* acts in this meditation, though as united to the *divine;* I answer, That as this is still to make *Christ* Mediator with *himself*, so the human nature is not *God-man;* and if the man, or human nature *alone*, be capable of doing the part of a Mediator, then it is not necessary that *Jesus Christ* should be more than a *man* inhabited by and related to God, in order to that office. Nor may it be said, that the *union* to the Divine nature gives an *infinite efficacy* to those acts, of which the human only is the principle; for unles by that union, the human nature was turned into an infinite or Divine nature, its acts can no more be reckoned properly and *intrinsically infinite* in this case, than his *body* or hu-

[u] 1 Chron. xxix. 20.

man *understanding* are infinite, because so united to an infinite nature.

But what fully demonstrates, that the human nature of Christ can never be an *effectual* Mediator, (according to them) no, not though it were personally united to the Divine, is this, viz. That they deny this human nature so united to have the knowledge of the secret mental prayers, the inward desires and distresses of all Christians, or to know any one's *heart:* And how then can he be a compassionate Intercessor in cases that he knows nothing of? Or how can he have a *fellow feeling* of their sufferings, which he knows not that they feel at all? What comfort is there in this account of Christ's mediation? The Divine nature is precluded from it, because they direct us to seek to that as the *ultimate* object through a Mediator; and the human nature, they say, may know nothing of our case, nor knows *our hearts*, whether we worship sincerely, or repent sincerely, or hypocritically only; and so knows not how to represent or recommend us to God. What a case now do these men bring us into? There is no *Mediator* left to interpose with the Supreme God; so that we must deal with him *immediately* and alone, which they will own is *far* from the gospel-doctrine, or method. Thus is the Lord Jesus turned out of his *office*, on a pretence of giving him higher honour. So that upon the whole, as far as I see, we had even as good be content with the Apostle's fair and plain account of this matter; if its being so very *intelligible* may not be an unpardonable objection against it, viz. That *there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.*[w] Never let us fear but *Paul* knew how to describe the *Mediator*, without leaving out the better half of him, or the principal nature. Our Mediator, according to him, was only called a

[w] 1 Tim. ii. 5.

man; who also is by office a *God*, or Ruler over all, *made* so by Him who *puts* all things under him.

And indeed as there are two principal *distinguishing* doctrines of *Christianity*, relating to the *unity* of the Supreme God, and the *one Mediator* with him; so the *Trinitarians* have lost them both among their several *parties*. For as they are divided into two principal parties (besides several sub-divisions) both among Conformists and *Dissenters*, one part holding *three* real Persons, or *infinite Beings;* the other but *one;* (for they are not yet agreed whether they worship *three* infinite Supreme Beings, or but *one;*) so between them both, these *two great doctrines* are subverted. The *Realists* leave room for a *Mediator in the Godhead;* but they destroy the unity of God, who is *one* infinite Being: on the *other hand*, they who hold true to the Divine Unity, or one infinite Being under *three modes*, or properties, or relations, do, by plain consequence, leave no place for such a *Mediator* as they require, viz. one who *is* an *infinite God*, to to be a Mediator with the infinite God; when there is no other infinite Being but his own, and he cannot be thought to intercede with *himself* neither. So that to keep the gospel-faith whole and *undefiled*, it is necessary that we avoid *both* these rocks, by believing *God* and his *Christ* to be two Beings; thus there may be room for one to mediate with the other; and that these two be not *equal* or *supreme* Beings; but one *subordinate* to the other, that so we may preserve the *unity* of the supreme God!

Let us then bethink ourselves seriously, not what the church in latter days has thought of Jesus Christ; but what his own apostles, *when inspired*, have thought of him. Methinks none was more likely, or ever had a fairer occasion to represent his Lord in the height of his *glory*, than the Apostle *Peter* in the day of *Pentecost;* that day of triumph,

with the newly and visibly inspired *Apostles!* Hear how magnificently he describes his glorious *Lord Jesus* before his murderers: *Ye men of* Israel, *hear these words; Jesus of* Nazareth, *a man approved of God among you, by miracles, wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you.*[x] Again, *Let all the house of* Israel *know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ!*[y] Now it is observable, the Apostle was aiming at such a description of Jesus Christ, as might strike the hearts of his *murderers*[z] with the greatest horror of their crime; and therefore could never omit the most *emphatical* branch of his description, *viz.* his *Infinite Deity*, if he had really been such. What a terrifying argument had that been to beget conviction in his persecutors beyond all the rest, to tell them, they had shed the blood of the *Infinite God himself?* It is certainly all *flat* and low that *Peter* says, in comparison of this. Did he not understand, or would he *betray his cause* by such an omission? And yet he only represents Christ as a God by *inhabitation* and exaltation; when he was far from being daunted with any fear to own Christ fully. Nay, if this *Deity* of Christ were a fundamental article of the *Christain Faith*, how comes it to pass, that when poor *convinced* souls, in anguish for their crimes, seek direction how to *be saved*[a] from them, the Apostle should not acquaint them with *this* article; but directs them to believe in *this Jesus*, such as he had described him? Did he direct wounded souls to an *insufficient* Saviour, without telling them he was the infinite God? Yet they are baptized and added to the church, and numbered among such as shall be *saved*: How can this be, if the supreme *God-head* of Christ be a fundamental article of the

[x] Acts ii. 22. [y] Ver. 36. [z] Ver. 23. [a] Ver. 37.

Christian faith, So Acts x. 38. *God was with him.* This was all.

To conclude, God and Christ (or one anointed) are two *disparates*, or different things, as much as Christ's *body* and *bread* are; and therefore cannot be predicated one of the other, in a proper sense, or without a figure, as all our writers against the *Romish* transubstantiation argue: And it is of equal force in the present case. *To be anointed* imports, to be raised by authority and honour conferred; it is in effect to say, the person is a creature, or inferior being: And therefore to say, that properly Christ is most High God, is to say, that the *Inferior* is *Supreme*, and the *Man* is *God;* which cannot be, otherwise than by a figure, as the bread is Christ's body, viz. *by relation*, *&c.* And truly if the business can be salved here, by making a *personal union* between God and Christ, I see not why the Papists may not set up such *another union* between Christ's body and the bread in the Eucharist, and then they may stoutly defend that it is the body of Christ *properly*. But indeed nothing is more obvious than the unsteadiness of many Protestant writers, when they write against the *Papists* and the *Unitarians:* How do they go backwards and forwards! And when they have triumphantly and fully beaten off the vain assaults and objections of the Papists, they take up their baffled arguments, and urge them the same way (as others did against them) against the *Unitarians!* And what they have maintained against the former as good arguments, notwithstanding *Romish* evasions; they oppose, when the *Unitarians* turn them against themselves in the point of the Trinity: they betake themselves, also, to like shifts and evasions. Thus let the *Papists* object to them the novelty of the Protestant religion, and ask them where was their religion and church before

Luther? They think it a weak cavil, and can tell them their religion was in the Bible, and their church among the primitive Christians, however it lay hid in the time of common apostacy: and yet to the *Unitarian* they can make the same objection, Where has any Christian church, for so many ages, held that Christ was not *God?*—Against the *Papist* they will prove, that the *Fathers* did not hold the elements to be Christ's real body and blood, because they oft call them the *images* thereof: but let the *Unitarians* argue that Christ is *not* the *supreme* God, because the scripture styles him the *image* of God, and therefore not the God whose image only he is; then, the thing itself and its image must be the *same* thing!—Against the *Papist* they can prove *St. Peter* was inferior to the church and the rest of the apostles, (though not singly to each) because he was *sent* up and down by them. This *Baronius* takes hold of, and tells them, by the same reason they must grant the *Arians'* argument to be good, viz. that the *Father* is greater than the *Son*, because the Son is *sent* by him. But let an *Unitarian* argue thus, and then, though the Father *sends*, and the Son be *sent* by him, yet they shall both be *equal*, and this shall make no difference!—Against the *Papists* they will boast, that they don't hoodwink the people in ignorance, but bid them enquire and examine, and the more the better; while it is ground of suspicion, that the *Papists* cheat men, by their keeping them from the light. But now having to do with the *Unitarians*, they tack about, and bid beware of reading and disputing; they are for an *implicit faith*, without examining into *deep mysteries;* they bid us *believe*, not *pry* into them; though we only desire to examine whether the *scriptures* do reveal *any* such mysteries at all! The *rest* we would believe, if we

could see *that;* and we desire no other liberty in interpreting scripture, than they take so justly in interpreting Christ's words, *this is my body.*—Upon Protestant principles the *Unitarians* think they can stand their ground, and defend themselves in these matters, as easily as the *Protestants* can against the Papists.

For my own part, as I write this under the serious impressions of those great relations in which the blessed *Jesus* stands to me, whom I *credit* as my great *teacher;* whom I desire to *admire* and love as my gracious endeared *benefactor,* beyond father and mother, or friends, &c. whom I reverence as my *Lord* and Ruler, and solemnly *expect* as my final glorious *Judge,* who is to come in his own and in his *Father's* glory;[b] and in the mean time deal with *God* through him, as my only *Mediator* and Intercessor: so I earnestly profess, that it is not without grievous and bitter sensations, that I should be employed in writing things, which by so many well-meaning Christians will be *misinterpreted,* to be derogatory to the honour of this great Redeemer. But I know he loves nothing but truth in his cause, and will never be offended with any who stand by his own words, viz. *The Father is greater than I.*[c] I think it a dangerous thing to say, *God is not greater* than he, or is not the *Head of Christ;* for, *whom will ye equal to me, saith the Holy One?*[d] I am persuaded it is truth I plead for, and that supports me.

However, I wish they who are adversaries to my persuasion, would learn at least the modesty of one of the earliest writers for *Christianity* since the apostles that we have, I mean *Justin Martyr:* Disputing with a *Jew,* and pleading for the honour of Jesus Christ, whom he calls *God by the will of the Father,* and one who *ministered to his will,* before his incarnation; this person attempts to

[b] Luke ix. 26. [c] John xiv. 28. [d] Isa. xl. 25.

shew, that Jesus Christ did *pre-exist* of old, as a God, (in *his* sense) and was born afterwards of a Virgin: but because, as he says, there were some who confessed him to be Christ, and yet denied *those points*, of his pre-existence, and his miraculous birth of a Virgin; that father calmly says to his adversary, *If I shall not demonstrate these things, that he did pre-exist, &c. and was born of a Virgin; yet still the cause is not lost, as to his being the Christ of God; if I do not prove that he did pre-exist, &c. it is just to say that I am mistaken in this thing only, and not deny that he is the Christ; for whosoever he be, that is every way demonstrated, that he is the Christ.* And as for those Christians who denied the above-said things, and held him to be only a man born in the ordinary way, he only says of them, *to whom I accord not.* He does not *damn* them who differed from him; nor will say the *Christian* religion is subverted, and Christ but an *impostor*, and a *broken reed* to trust on, if he be not the very *supreme* God, (which is the ranting *dialect* of some in our age:) No, but still he was sure *Jesus was the true Christ*, whatever *else* he might be mistaken in. It is desperate wickedness in men to hazard the reputation of the truth and holiness of the blessed *Jesus* upon a difficult and disputable *opinion;* to dare to say, that if they are mistaken in their opinion, (which I verily believe) then Jesus Christ is a *lyar* and *deceiver*, a *mock-saviour*, and the like. What is this but to expose him to the scorn of infidels?

So that I see with sorrow, that to this very day, even among professed Christians themselves, Christ crucified is to *some* a stumbling-block, and to *others* foolishness. If he be not as *good* and *great* as the God who *appointed* him for a *Saviour*, though he be allowed to be a *man approved of God*, by signs

and mighty wonders which God did *by* him, and *by* whom God made the *worlds;* though he be granted to be *one* in whom dwelt all the fullness of the *Godhead,*[f] so as it never dwelt before in prophets or any other; though he be *One with the Father,* by unity of consent and will, as *Calvin* interprets John x. 30; one in *testimony* with the Father and Spirit, as *Beza* and many others understand that in 1 John v. 7; though he be the most lively visible *image* of God that the world ever saw, so that he who sees him does in great measure *see the Father,* as in a *bright mirror,* John xiv. 10; though he be owned and served as one *far above* angels and archangels, and *over all* powers in heaven and earth, a God or Ruler; the great Administrator of God's kingdom, both on earth and in the invisible *hades,* as *having the keys,* or ministerial power, *of death and hell:*[g] Yet, after all this, if he be not the very *supreme God* himself; nay, to complete the absurdity, if he be not the *same* very God, whose *Son* and *image* he is, he shall be no *Mediator* for them! They do *ex hypothesi,* or on this supposition, openly disown him for their Saviour and confidence! They are ashamed to trust in in him, and seem rather to deride and reproach him, as *insufficient* and contemptible, than to *believe* on him!—These things are to me a very grievous *offence,* who think it a great pity that so excellent a constitution as the Gospel is, so *amiable* to contemplate, so proper to engage our thankful admiration for the *grace and wisdom* it contains: should either be lost in the clouds of an *affected* obscurity, or exposed to the derision of ungodly scoffers!

'Tis yet a farther grief to think what a fatal stop is hereby put to the progress of the Gospel; whose rejection by *Jews, Mahometans,* and *Pagans,* is

[f] John xiv. 10. [g] Rev. i. 18.

undeniably occasioned by the *common doctrine* of the incarnation of *God*. One may read in *Le Compte's* History of *China*, how the Heathens derided the Christians' doctrine of a *mortal God;* and upon that account looked upon Christianity as *fabulous* as their own religion. And Dr. *Causabon*,[h] in his Book of *Credulity and Incredulity*, says, he could prove by many instances out of history, that this *doctrine has kept more people from embracing the Christian Faith, than any other thing he knew of.* Now though I grant, that if it be the certain *truth of God*, this must be no argument against receiving it: yet surely it should make men very cautious and impartial in their inquiry about it, lest they bring on themselves the *woe* denounced against them by whom offences (that is, stumbling-blocks in the way of the Gospel) do come.

In the mean time, in the midst of these troubles, it is a great and sweet *refreshment* to wait and hope for a remove to the *Mount Moriah*, the land of *vision* above, where all these shades of the melancholy night shall vanish away, and an eternal day of clear *light* and peace shall shine on them *who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity;* in *whose* glorious dignity I rejoice; nay, I desire to boast and glory in this exalted, enthroned *Redeemer;* for *worthy is the Lamb to receive glory*, and honour, and blessing, and power. *Amen;* so be it!

Now to *Him* who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests to *God*, even the *Father*, to Him *be glory and dominion for ever!*

But this I *confess unto thee, that after the way which they call* Heresy, *so worship* I *the God of my Fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets.* Acts xxiv. 14.

[h] Page 118.

THE

SANDY FOUNDATION SHAKEN;

OR,

Those so generally believed and applauded DOCTRINES

Of { One God, subsisting in three distinct and separate Persons, / The impossibility of God's pardoning Sinners, a plenary Satisfaction, / The Justification of impure Persons by an imputative Righteousness, } Refuted,

From the Authority of Scripture Testimonies and right Reason.

By WILLIAM PENN,

A Builder on that Foundation which cannot be moved.

But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all Things. 1 Cor. viii. 6.

Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth Iniquity? He retaineth not his Anger for ever, because he delighteth in Mercy. Micah vii. 18.

For I will not justify the wicked. Exod. xxiii. 7.

IT was the fault of some in ancient times, that they made void God's law by mens' traditions, and certainly I may now assume the same complaint; for whilst I take a serious prospect of the spiritual nature and tendency of the second covenant, which God Almighty, in the fulness of time, by his prophets, prophesied to make and perfect; and also the accomplishment thereof by Jesus Christ, and what was brought to pass amongst the primitive believers; methinks I do not only see an utter abolishment of ceremonial worships, but the inscribing that spiritual law on the heart, and infusion of holy fear to the inward parts, whereby each person be-

came capacitated to know so much of God, as suited with his present state, from an infallible demonstration in himself, and not on the slender grounds of men's lo-here interpretations, or lo-there; for the kingdom of God is within, where himself must be the teacher of his people: But on the other hand, when, from the noise of every party's pretensions to and contentions for their own way as most infallible, I am induced to an impartial examination of them, alas! how have all adulterated from the purity both of scripture record, and primitive example! receiving for unquestionable doctrines the fallible apprehensions and uncertain determinations of such councils, whose faction, prejudice, and cruelty soon paralleled the foregoing heathenish persecutions; and yet that the results of persons so incompetently qualified should at this day in their authority remain unquestioned by the nations, is matter both of astonishment and pity; but an implicit faith has ever been the consequence of ignorance, idleness, and fear, being strong impediments to a judicious enquiry how far professed and imposed opinions have their consistency with reason and the true religion. But that which most of all deserves a lamentation is, that Protestants, whose better arguments have confuted the plea of such as made tradition and men's prescriptions unquestionable in circumstantials, should themselves, by print and practice, so openly declare and contend for its authority in essentials; as must be obvious to any that observe their zealous anathemas against whomsoever refuse a compliance with them in doctrines, manifestly bottomed upon men's nice inventions.

This is the right state of the controversy that is maintained by us (contemptibly called Quakers) against the world, and the undoubted reason of our severe treatment at its hands; the end of God Al-

mighty's raising us, being for no other purpose than to declare, that which our eyes have seen, our ears heard, and which our hands have handled of the Eternal Word, in opposition to the private opinions, conjectures, and interpretations of men concerning God and religion, that all people might thereby be reduced to faith in and obedience to the universal grace which brings salvation; which as it only can restore sound judgment concerning God, and effect redemption from iniquity, so its being relinquished by men was the very ground both of their division in judgment and corruption in manners.

That this hath been and is our case, I shall produce an instance, which is indeed the occasion of this treatise.

Two persons lately of Thomas Vincent's auditory in Spitalfields, (who goes under the notion of a presbyter) being desirous to prove all things, and to hold fast the best, visited our meeting, to understand if we were as really deserving blame as represented by our enemies; where it then pleased Divine Goodness to visit them with the call of his light from the inventions, carnal observations, will-worship, and vain conversation of those to whom they were formerly related, that they might be made children of the day; and though its appearance might be small, yet sufficient to discover them to have been inhabitants of the night, and can never be rejected, but it shall bring that condemnation which shall farther testify it to be of God.

But their relinquishing his congregation so incensed this presbyterian preacher, as that his peevish zeal transported him beyond not only the moderation of Christianity, but the civility of education, venting his folly and prejudice much to this pur-

pose,—That he had as lieve they should go to a bawdy-house, as to frequent the Quakers' meetings, because of their erroneous and damnable doctrines; and pointing to the window said, if there should stand a cup of poison, I would rather drink it than suck in their damnable doctrines. He further expressed himself in this manner to one of them: If ever you go again, I will give you up, and God will give you up, that you may believe a lie, and be damned. Which storms of foul and railing accusation, proving ineffectual to shipwreck that little grain of faith, his hearers, as forgetting they hold their preaching by connivance, and the many appeals made by their non-conforming brethren for an indulgence, came with this caution to the pater-familias, (or he that was both husband and father to the concerned parties) that he would exercise his authority, as well to refuse them to all Quaker-visitants, as prohibit them the liberty of their consciences in frequenting our meetings.

All which we could not for the truth-sake let pass in silence, and therefore did require him to let us have a public meeting, in which we might have liberty to answer on the behalf both of ourselves and principles; which after some demur was granted, the day he appointed, and at the second hour in the afternoon. But that he might not want applause of many voices, and doubtless to prevent our friends, (as I am informed) bespoke his usual auditory to be there at one; and, as a man that would not overspend himself, or incur a nonplus for want of seconds, he had his third and fourth, to wit, Thomas Danson, Thomas Doolittle, and ——— Maddocks, who at their times (and often out of them) did interpose, to whom George Whitehead mostly answered; nor had there any thing been spoken by another but from their own example.

The matter in controversy will be related in the beginning of this treatise, as a necessary preludium or introduction to the following discourse; the manner of it was so gross, that I know not how to represent it better than by the levity and rudeness of some prize, laughing, hissing, shoving, striking, and stigmatizing us with the opprobrious terms of confident fellow, impudent villain, blasphemer, &c. And, as the usual refuge of shallow persons (when they have little else to say, to prepossess their hearers with prejudice against the principles of such as do oppose them) he questioned much whether I was not some Jesuit; not remembering, or at least unwilling to let the people know, that none have been, nor are more instant in the vindication of that doctrine he and his brother did assert, (to-wit, *God subsisting in three distinct persons)* than the Jesuits, so that if I should not as well reflect a scandal upon their learning by a comparison, as he did upon my principle, I could more truly invert Jesuitism upon himself: in short, they neither would keep to scripture-terms themselves, nor suffer it in any others; but looking upon George Whitehead's explanation of their terms, and reduction of their matter, if possible, to a scripture-sense, (thereby fitting it to the auditors' apprehension) to be an indirect way of answering, (as that which nakedly did expose their traditional folly to the vulgar) T. V. in an abrupt manner fell to his prayer, in which he falsely, and with many strangely-affected whines, accused us for blasphemers unto God; and that he might prevent the clearing of ourselves, he desired the people, when he had finished, to be gone, giving them an example by his and three brethren's retreat: but we being desirous farther to inform the people of our innocency, they did not only (as before) endeavour

to pull us down, but put the candles out, though several persons of good esteem continued whilst we spoke in vindication of ourselves from the invectives of our adversaries.

The people still remaining undispersed, T. V. came very palely down the stairs, (having a candle in his hand) required their dismission, at which time he promised us, at our request, another meeting; but as one that knew not well what he said, or never purposed to perform what he promised, has given us since to understand, he cannot in conscience spare us so much time; yet to satisfy G. W. and myself, in private, he could agree; which surely cannot be termed another meeting, since then it must relate to the preceding one: but how near the relation is betwixt an accusation before hundreds, and a satisfaction before none, must needs be obvious to every unbiassed person:——our right should have been altogether as public as our wrong:——for which cause we were necessitated to visit his meeting, where, on a lecture-day, (after a continued silence during all his worship) we modestly entreated we might be cleared from those unjust reflections before his congregation, leaving a disputation (if he could not then attend it) to some more seasonable opportunity: but as one, who resolved injustice to men's reputation, as well as cowardice, in baulking a defence of his own principles, he slunk most shamefully away; nor would any there, though urged to it, assume his place to vindicate his practice towards us, or his doctrines then delivered.

Reader, what is thy opinion of this savage entertainment? Would Socrates, Cato, or Seneca, whom they called heathens, have treated us with such unseemly carriage? I suppose not: and well is it for the truly sober and conscientious, they are not liable to those severe lashes, and that peevish usage, which

are the inseparable appendix to a Scotch directory, whose cold and cutting gales ever have designed to nip and blast the fairest blossoms of greater reformation. So much for history.

What remains is to inform the reader, that with great brevity I have discussed and endeavoured a total enervation of those cardinal points, and chief doctrines, so firmly believed, and continually imposed for articles of Christian Faith: 1. *The trinity of separate persons, in the unity of essence.* 2. *God's incapacity to forgive, without the fullest satisfaction paid him by another.* 3. *A justification of impure persons from an imputative righteousness.* Which principles let me tell thee, reader, are not more repugnant to scripture, reason, and souls-security, than most destructive to God's honour, in his *unity*, *mercy*, and *purity*.

Therefore I beseech thee to exterminate passion from her predominancy, in the perusal of this discourse, since it was writ in love to thee; that whilst it is thy desire to know, love, and fear God Almighty, above men's precepts, thou mayest not miss so good an end, by the blind embraces of tradition for truth. But in the nobility of a true Berean, search and enquire; letting the good old verity, not a pretended antiquity (whilst a mere novelty) and solid reason, not an over-fond credulity, sway the balance of thy judgment, that both stability and certainty may accompany thy determinations.

Farewell.

A short Confutation, by way of Recapitulation, of what was objected against us at Thomas Vincent's Meeting.

IF disputations prove at any time ineffectual, it is either to be imputed to the ignorance and ambiguity of the disputants, or to the rudeness and prejudice of the auditory: all which may be truly affirmed of T. V. with his three brethren, and congregation.

The accusation being general, viz. that the Quakers held damnable doctrines, George Whitehead on their behalf stood up, and, as it was his place, willingly would have given the people an information of our principles, which, if objected against, he was as ready to defend by the authority of scripture and reason; but instead of this better method, T. V. as one that is often employed in catechistical lectures, falls to interrogatories, begging that himself, he in his slander had taken for granted, to-wit, the knowledge of our principles.

The question was this, 'Whether we owned *one 'Godhead, subsisting in three distinct and separate 'persons,'* as the result of various revises and amendments; which *being denied by us, as a doctrine no where scriptural,* T. V. frames this syllogism from the beloved disciple's words:

"There are three that bear record in heaven, the "Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and "these three are one."[i]

'These are either three manifestations, three ope-'rations, three substances, or three somethings else 'besides subsistences.'

[i] John v. 7.

'But they are not three manifestations, three ope-
'rations, three substances, nor three any thing else
'besides subsistences:'

Ergo, Three subsistences.

G. W. utterly rejected his terms, as not to be found in scripture, nor deducible from the place he instanced: wherefore he desires their explanation of their terms, inasmuch as *God did not choose to wrap his truths up in heathenish metaphysicks, but in plain language:* notwithstanding we could not obtain a better explanation, than person; or of person, than the mode of a substance; to all which G. W. and myself urged several scriptures, *proving God's complete unity:* and when we queried how God was to be understood, if in an abstractive sense from his substance, they concluded it a point more fit for admiration than disputation. But a little to review his syllogism; the manner of it shews him as little a scholar, as its matter does a Christian; but I shall overlook the first, and so much of the second, as might deserve my objection to his major, and give in short my reason, why I flatly deny his minor proposition. *No one substance can have three distinct subsistences, and preserve its own unity:* for granting them the most favourable definition, every subsistence will have its own substance; so that three distinct subsistences, or manners of being, will require three distinct substances, or beings; consequently three Gods. For if the infinite *God-head* subsists in three separate manners or forms, then is not any one of them a perfect and complete subsistence without the other two; so parts, and something finite is in God: or if infinite, then three distinct infinite subsistences; and what is this but to assert three Gods, since none is infinite but God? And on the contrary, there being an inseparability betwixt the substance and its subsist-

ence, the unity of substance will not admit a trinity of incommunicable or distinct subsistences.

T. D. being asked, of whom was Christ the express image, from his alleging that scripture in the Hebrews; answered, of God's subsistence, or manner of being: from whence two things in short follow as my reply, it makes God a Father only by subsistence, and Christ a son without a substance. Besides, it is falsely rendered in the Hebrews, since the Greek does not say χαρακτὴρ προσώπου, but χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, the character of substance.

And if he will peruse a farther discovery of his error, and explanation of the matter, let him read Col. i. 15, "who is the image of the invisible God."

And because G. W., willing to bring this strange doctrine to the capacity of the people, compared their three persons to three apostles, saying he did not understand how *Paul, Peter, and John could be three persons and one apostle*, (a most apt comparison to detect their doctrine) one —— Maddocks, whose zeal out-stript his knowledge, bustling hard, as one that had some necessarv matter for the decision of our controversy, instead thereof (perhaps to save his brethren, or shew himself) silences our farther controverting of the principle, by a syllogistical, but impertinent reflection upon G. W.'s person. It runs thus: 'He that scornfully and reproachfully compares our doctrine of the blessed trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit, one in essence, but three in persons, to three finite men, as Paul, Peter, and John, is a blasphemer. But you G. W. have so done. Ergo.'

A strange way of argumentation, to beg what cannot be granted him, and take for granted what still remains a question, viz. that there are three distinct and separate persons in one essence: let them first *prove their trinity*, and then charge their

distinct and separate persons in one essence: let them *prove their trinity*, and then charge their blasphemy; but I must not forget this person's self-confutation, who, to be plainer, called them three Hes, and if he can find an He without a substance, or prove that a subsistence is any other than the form of an He, he would do well to justify himself from the imputation of ignorance.

And till their hypothesis be of better authority, G. W. neither did, nor does by that comparison, design men's invention so much honour.

For it is to be remarked, that G. W. is no otherwise a blasphemer, than by drawing direct consequences from their own principles, and re-charging them upon themselves: so that he did not speak his own apprehensions by his comparison, but the sense of their assertion; therefore blasphemer and blasphemy are their own.

The Trinity of distinct and separate Persons, in the Unity of Essence, refuted from Scripture.

"AND he said, Lord God, there is no god "like unto thee, to whom then will ye "liken me, or shall I be equal, saith the Holy "One?[k]—I am the Lord, and there is none else, "there is no God besides me. Thus saith the Lord "thy redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, I will also "praise thee, O my God; unto thee will I sing, "O Holy One of Israel, Jehovah shall be One, and "his name One."[l] Which, with a cloud of other

[k] 1 Kings viii. 23. Isa. xi. 25. xiv. 5, 6.
[l] Isa. xlviii. 17. Ps. xxi. 22. Zac. xiv. 9.

testimonies that might be urged, evidently demonstrate, that in the days of the first covenant, and prophets, *but One was the Holy God, and God but that Holy One.*—Again, "And Jesus said unto "him, why callest thou me good? there is none "good but One, and that is God. And this is life "eternal, that they might know Thee (father) the "Only true God. Seeing it is One God that shall "justify. There be gods many,—but unto us there "is but One God, the father, of whom are all "things. One God and father, who is above all "things. For there is One God. To the Only-"wise God be glory now and for ever."[m] From all which I shall lay down this one assertion, that the testimonies of scripture, both under the law, and since the gospel dispensation, *declare One to be God, and God to be One,* on which I shall raise this argument:

If God, as the scriptures testify, hath never been declared or believed, but as *the Holy One;* then will it follow, that *God is not an Holy Three,* nor doth subsist in *Three distinct and separate Holy Ones:* but the before-cited scriptures undeniably prove that One is God, and God only is that Holy One; therefore he cannot be divided into, or subsist in an Holy Three, or Three distinct and separate Holy Ones.—Neither can this receive the least prejudice from that frequent but impertinent distinction, that that He is One in substance, but Three in persons or subsistences; since God was not declared or believed incompletely, or without his subsistences: nor did He require homage from his creatures as an incomplete or abstracted being, but as God the Holy One, for so He should be manifested and worshipped without that which was absolutely ne-

[m] Mat. xix. 17. John xvii. 3. Rom. iii. 30. 1 Cor. viii. 6i Eph. iv. 6. 1 Tim. ii. 5. Jude, ver. 25.

cessary to himself:———So that either the testimonies of the afore-mentioned scriptures are to be believed concerning God, that he is entirely and completely, not abstractly and distinctly, the Holy One; or else their authority to be denied by these Trinitarians: and on the contrary, if they pretend to credit those holy testimonies, they must necessarily conclude their kind of trinity a fiction.

Refuted from right Reason.

1. If there be three distinct and separate persons, then three distinct and separate substances, because every person is inseparable from its own substance; and as there is no person that is not a substance in common acceptation among men, so do the scriptures plentifully agree herein: and since the father is God, and the son is God, and the spirit is God, (which their opinion necessitates them to confess) then unless the father, son, and spirit, are three distinct nothings, they must be three distinct substances, and consequently three distinct gods.

2. It is farther proved, if it be considered, that either the divine persons are finite or infinite. If the first, then something finite is inseparable to the infinite substance, whereby something finite is in God; if the last, then three distinct infinites, three omnipotents, three eternals, and so three gods.

3. If each person be God, and that God subsists in three persons, then in each person are three persons or gods, and from three they will increase to nine, and so *ad infinitum*.

4. But if they shall deny the three persons or subsistences to be infinite, (for so there would unavoidably be three gods) it will follow that they must be finite, and so the absurdity is not abated from what it was; for that of one substance having

three subsistences is not greater than that an infinite being should have three finite modes of subsisting. But though that mode which is finite cannot answer to a substance that is infinite; yet to try if we can make their principle to consist, let us conceive that three persons, which may be finite separately, make up an infinite conjunctly; however this will follow, that they are no more incommunicable or separate, nor properly subsistencies, but a subsistence; for the infinite substance cannot find a bottom or subsistence in any one or two, therefore jointly. And here I am also willing to overlook finiteness in the Father, Son, and Spirit, which this doctrine must suppose.

5. Again, if these three distinct persons are one, with some one thing, as they say they are with the God-head, then are not they incommunicable among themselves; but so much the contrary, as to be one in the place of another: for if that the only God is the father, and Christ be that only God, then is Christ the father. So if that one God be the son, and the spirit that one God, then is the spirit the son, and so round. Nor is it possible to stop, or that it should be otherwise, since if the divine nature be inseparable from the three persons, or communicated to each, and each person have the whole divine nature, then is the son in the father, and the spirit in the son, unless that the Godhead be as incommunicable to the persons, as they are reported to be amongst themselves; or that the three persons have distinctly allotted them such a proportion of the divine nature, as is not communicable to each other; which is alike absurd. Much more might be said to manifest the gross contradiction of this Trinitarian doctrine, as vulgarly received; but I must be brief.

Information and Caution.

Before I shall conclude this head, it is requisite I should inform thee, reader, concerning its original. Thou mayest assure thyself, it is not from the scriptures, nor reason, since so expressly repugnant; although all broachers of their own inventions strongly endeavour to reconcile them with that holy record. Know then, my friend, *it was born above three hundred years after the ancient gospel was declared;* and that through the nice distinctions and too daring curiosity of the Bishop of Alexandria, who being as hotly opposed by Arius, their zeal so reciprocally blew the fire of contention, animosity, and persecution, till at last they sacrificed each other to their mutual revenge.

Thus it was conceived in *ignorance*, brought forth and maintained by *cruelty*; for though he that was strongest imposed his opinion, persecuting the contrary, yet the scale turning on the Trinitarian side, it has there continued through all the Romish generations; and notwithstanding it hath obtained the name of Athanasian from Athanasius, (a stiff man, witness his carriage towards Constantine the emperor) because supposed to have been most concerned in the framing that creed in which this doctrine is asserted; yet have I never seen one copy void of a suspicion, rather to have been the results of Popish school-men; which I could render more perspicuous, did not brevity necessitate me to an omission.

Be therefore cautioned, reader, not to embrace the determination of prejudiced councils for evangelical doctrine; which the scriptures bear no certain testimony to, neither was believed by the primitive saints, or thus stated by any I have read of in the first, second, or third centuries; particularly

Ireneus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, with many others who appear wholly foreign to the matter in controversy. But seeing that private spirits, and those none of the most ingenious, have been the parents and guardians of this so generally received doctrine; let the time past suffice, and be admonished to apply thy mind unto that light and grace which brings salvation; that by obedience thereunto, those mists tradition hath cast before thy eyes may be expelled, and thou receive a certain knowledge of that God, whom to know is life eternal, not to be divided, but *One pure, entire, and eternal Being;* who in the fulness of time *sent forth his Son,* as the true light which enlighteneth every man; that whosoever followed him (the light) might be translated from the dark notions and vain conversations of men to this holy light, in which only sound judgment and eternal life are obtainable: who so many hundred years since, in person, testified the virtue of it, and has communicated unto all such a proportion as may enable them to follow his example.

The vulgar Doctrine of Satisfaction being dependent on the second Person of the Trinity, refuted from Scripture.

'THAT man having transgressed the righteous 'law of God, and so exposed to the penalty 'of eternal wrath, it is altogether impossible for 'God to remit or forgive without a plenary satisfac-'tion; and that there was no other way by which 'God could obtain satisfaction, or save men, than 'by inflicting the penalty of infinite wrath and ven-'geance on Jesus Christ, the second person of the

'trinity, who, for sins past, present, and to come, 'hath wholly borne and paid it, (whether for all, 'or but some) to the offended justice of his father.'

1. "And the Lord passed by before him, (Moses) "and proclaimed, the Lord, the Lord God, merci-"ful and gracious, keeping mercy for thousands, "forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin."[n] [From whence I shall draw this position—that since God has proclaimed himself a gracious, merciful, and forgiving God, it is not inconsistent with his nature to remit without any other consideration than his own love: otherwise He could not justly come under the imputation of so many gracious attributes, with whom it is impossible to pardon, and necessary to exact the payment of the utmost farthing.]

2. "For if ye turn again to the Lord, the Lord "your God is gracious and merciful, and will not "turn away his face from you."[o] [Where, how natural is it to observe, that God's remission is grounded on their repentance; and not that it is impossible for God to pardon without plenary satisfaction, since the possibility, nay certainty, of the contrary, viz. his grace and mercy, is the great motive or reason of that loving invitation to return!]

3. "They hardened their necks, and hearkened "not to thy commandments; but Thou art a God "ready to pardon, gracious and merciful."[p] [Can the honest-hearted reader conceive, that God should thus be mercifully qualified, whilst executing the rigour of the law transgressed, or not acquitting without the debt be paid him by another? I suppose not.]

4. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the "unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him re-"turn unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon "him, and to our God, for he will abundantly

[n] Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7. [o] 2 Chron. xxx. 9. [p] Neh. ix. 16, 17.

pardon."[q] [Come, let the unprejudiced judge, if this scripture doctrine is not very remote from saying, his nature cannot forgive sin, therefore let Christ pay him full satisfaction, or He will certainly be avenged; which is the substance of that strange opinion.]

5. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that "I will make a new covenant with the house of "Israel; I will put my law in their inward "parts; I will forgive their iniquity, and I will "remember their sin no more."[r] [Here is God's mere grace asserted, against the pretended necessity of a satisfaction to procure his remission; and this Paul acknowledgeth to be the dispensation of the gospel, in his eighth chapter to the Hebrews: so that this new doctrine doth not only contradict the nature and design of the second covenant, but seems, in short, to discharge God both from his mercy and omnipotence.]

6. "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth "iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the "remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his "anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy."[s] [Can there be a more express passage to clear, not only the possibility, but real inclinations in God to pardon sin, and "not retain his anger for ever?" since the prophet seems to challenge all other gods to try their excellency by his God: herein describing the supremacy of his power and super-excellency of his nature, "that He pardoneth iniquity, and retaineth not his anger for ever." So that if the satisfactionists should ask the question, who is a God like unto ours, that cannot pardon iniquity, nor pass by transgression, but retaineth his anger until somebody make him satisfaction? I answer, many amongst the harsh and severe rulers of the

[q] Isa. lv. 7. [r] Jer. xxxi. 31, 33, 34. [s] Micah vii. 18.

nation; but as for my God, He is exalted above them all, upon the throne of his mercy, "who "pardoneth iniquity, and retaineth not his anger "for ever, but will have compassion upon us."]

7. "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our "debtors." [Where nothing can be more obvious, than that which is forgiven, is not paid: and if it is our duty to forgive our debtors, without a satisfaction received, and that God is to forgive us, as we forgive them, then is a satisfaction totally excluded: Christ farther paraphrases upon that part of his prayer, ver. 14, "For if ye forgive their tres-"passes, your heavenly Father will also forgive "you." Where he as well argues the equity of God's forgiving them from their forgiving others, as he encourages them to forgive others from the example of God's mercy in forgiving them: which is more amply expressed, chap. xviii. where the kingdom of heaven (that consists in righteousness) is represented by a king, "who, upon his debtor's "petition, had compassion, and forgave him; but "the same treating his fellow-servant without the "least forbearance, the king condemned his un-"righteousness, and delivered him over to the "tormentors." But how had this been a fault in the servant, if his king's mercy had not been proposed for his example? How most unworthy therefore is it of God, and blasphemous, may I justly term it, for any to assert that forgiveness impossible to God, which is not only possible, but enjoined to men!]

8. "For God so loved the world, that He gave "his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth "in him should not perish, but have everlasting "life."[u] [By which it appears, that God's love is

[t] Mat. vi. 12. [u] John iii. 16.

not the effect of Christ's satisfaction, but Christ is the proper gift and effect of God's love.]

9. "To him give all the prophets witness, that "through his name, whosoever believeth in him, "shall receive remission of sins."[w] [So that remission came by believing his testimony, and obeying his precepts, and not by a strict satisfaction.]

10. "If God be for us, who can be against us? "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered "him up for us all."[x] [Which evidently declares it to be God's act of love, otherwise, if He must be paid, He should be at the charge of his own satisfaction, for He delivered up the Son.]

11. "And all things are of God, who hath recon-"ciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath "given to us the ministry of reconciliation, to-wit, "that God was in Christ reconciling the world "to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto "them."[y] [How undeniably apparent is it, that God is so far from standing off in high displeasure, and upon his own terms contracting with his Son for a satisfaction, as being otherwise uncapable to be reconciled, that he became himself the reconciler by Christ, and afterwards by the apostles, his ambassadors, to whom was committed the ministry of reconciliation.]

12. "In whom we have redemption through his "blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the "riches of his grace."[z] [Now what relation satisfaction has to forgiveness of sins, or how any can construe grace to be strict justice, the meanest understanding may determine.]

13. "But the God of all grace, who hath called "us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus."[a] [He does not say, that God's justice, in considera-

[w] Acts x. 43. [x] Rom. viii. 31, 32. [y] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. [z] Eph. i. 7. [a] 1 Peter v. 10.

tion of Christ's satisfaction, acquitted us from sins past, present, and to come, and therefore hath called us to his eternal glory; but from his grace.]

14. "In this was manifest the love of God to-"wards us, because that God sent his only-begotten "Son into the world, that we might live through "him."[b] Which plainly attributes Christ, in his doctrine, life, miracles, death, and sufferings, to God, as the gift and expression of his eternal love, for the salvation of men.]

1. In abolishing that other covenant, which consisted in eternal and shadowy ordinances, and that made none clean as concerning the conscience.

2. In promulgating his message, of a most free and universal tender of life and salvation, unto all that believed and followed him, (the light) in all his righteousness, the very end of his appearance being to destroy the works of the devil, and which every man only comes to experience, as he walks in an holy subjection to that measure of light and grace, wherewith the fulness hath enlightened him.

3. In seconding his doctrines with signs, miracles, and a most innocent self-denying life.

4. In ratifying and confirming all (with great love and holy resignation) by the offering up of his body to be crucified by wicked hands: who is now ascended far above all heavens, and is thereby become a most complete captain, and perfect example.

So that I can by no means conclude, but openly declare [*but by openly declaring*] that the scriptures of truth are not only silent in reference to this doctrine of rigid satisfaction, but that it is altogether inconsistent with the dignity of God, and very repugnant to the conditions, nature, and tendency of that second covenant, concerning which their testimony is so clear.

[b] 1 John iv. 9.

The Absurdities, that unavoidably follow the Comparison of this Doctrine with the Sense of Scripture.

---

1. THAT God is gracious to forgive, and yet it is impossible for him, unless the debt be fully satisfied.

2. That the finite and impotent creature is more capable of extending mercy and forgiveness, than the infinite and omnipotent Creator.

3. "That God so loved the world, he gave his "only Son to save it;" and yet that God stood off in high displeasure, and Christ gave himself to God as a complete satisfaction to his offended justice: with many more such like gross consequences that might be drawn.

Refuted from right Reason.

But if we should grant a scripture silence, as to the necessity of Christ's so satisfying his Father's justice; yet so manifest would be the contradictions, and foul the repugnancies to right reason, that who had not veiled his understanding with the dark suggestions of unwarrantable tradition, or contracted his judgment to the implicit apprehensions of some over-valued acquaintance, might with great facility discriminate to a full resolution in this point: for admitting God to be a creditor, or he to whom the debt should be paid; and Christ, he that satifies or pays it on the behalf of man, the debtor; this question will arise, Whether he paid that debt *as God*, or *man*, or *both*? (to use their own terms.)

Not as God.

1. In that it divides the unity of the Godhead, by two distinct acts, of being offended, and not offended; of condemning justice and redeeming mercy; of requiring a satisfaction, and then making it.

2. Because if Christ pay the debt *as God*, then the Father and the Spirit being God, they also pay the debt.

3. Since God is to be satisfied, and that Christ is God, he consequently is to be satisfied; and who shall satisfy his infinite justice?

4. But if Christ has satisfied God the Father, Christ being also God, it will follow then that he has satisfied himself, (which cannot be.)

5. But since God the Father was once to be satisfied, and that it is impossible he should do it himself, nor yet the Son or Spirit, because the same God; it naturally follows, that the debt remains unpaid, and these satisfactionists thus far are still at a loss.

Not as Man.

6. The justice offended being infinite, his satisfaction ought to bear a proportion therewith, which Jesus Christ, *as man*, could never pay, he being finite, and from a finite cause could not proceed an infinite effect; for so man may be said to bring forth God, since nothing below the Divinity itself can rightly be stiled infinite.

Not as God and Man.

7. For where two mediums, or middle propositions, are singly inconsistent with the nature of the end, for which they were at first propounded, their conjunction does rather augment than lessen the diffi-

culty of its accomplishment; and this I am persuaded must be obvious to every unbiassed understanding.

But admitting one of these three mediums possible for the payment of an infinite debt; yet, pray observe the most unworthy and ridiculous consequences, that will unavoidably attend the impossibility of God's pardoning sinners without a satisfaction.

Consequences irreligious and irrational.

1. That it is unlawful and impossible for God Almighty to be gracious and merciful, or to pardon transgressors; than which what is more unworthy of God?

2. That God was inevitably compelled to this way of saving men; the highest affront to his in-incontroulable nature.

3. That it was unworthy of God to pardon, but not to inflict punishment on the innocent, or requiring a satisfaction where there was nothing due.

4. It doth not only dis-acknowledge the true virtue and real intent of Christ's life and death, but entirely deprives God of that praise which is owing to his greatest love and goodness.

5. It represents the Son more kind and compassionate than the Father; whereas if both be the same God, then either the Father is as loving as the Son, or the Son as angry as the Father.

6. It robs God of the gift of his Son for our redemption (which the scriptures attribute to the unmerited love he had for the world) in affirming the Son purchased that redemption from the Father, by the gift of himself to God, as our complete satisfaction.

7. Since Christ could not pay what was not his own, it follows, that in the payment of his own, the case still remains equally grievous; since the debt is not hereby absolved or forgiven, but transferred

only: and by consequence we are no better provided for salvation than before, owing that now to the Son, which was once owing to the Father.

8. It no way renders man beholding, [*beholden*] or in the least obliged to God; since by their doctrine He would not have abated us, nor did He Christ the last farthing; so that the acknowledgments are peculiarly the Son's; which destroys the whole current of scripture-testimony for his good-will towards men.——*O the infamous portraiture this doctrine draws of the Infinite Goodness!* Is this your retribution, O injurious satisfactionists?

9. That God's justice is satisfied for sins past, present, and to come; whereby God and Christ have lost both their power of enjoining godliness, and prerogative of punishing disobedience; for what is once paid is not revokable; and if punishment should arrest any for their debts, it either argues a breach on God's or Christ's part, or else that it has not been sufficiently solved, and the penalty completely sustained by another; forgetting, "that "every one must apppear before the judgment-seat "of Christ, to receive according to the things done "in the body: yea, every one must give an account "of himself to God."[c] But many more are the gross absurdities and blasphemies that are the genuine fruits of this so-confidently-believed doctrine of satisfaction.

A Caution.

Let me advise, nay warn thee, reader, by no means to admit an entertainment of this principle, by whomsoever recommended; since it does not only divest the glorious God of his sovereign power, both to pardon and punish, but as certainly insinu-

[c] Rom. xiv. 12. 2 Cor. xv. 10.

ates a licentiousness, at least a liberty, that unbecomes the nature of that ancient gospel once preached amongst the primitive saints, and that from an apprehension of a satisfaction once paid for all. Whereas I must tell thee, that unless thou seriously repent, and no more grieve God's holy Spirit, placed in thy inmost parts, but art thereby taught to deny all ungodliness, and led into all righteousness; at the tribunal of the great Judge, thy plea shall prove invalid, and thou receive thy reward without respect to any other thing than the deeds done in the body: "Be not deceived, God will not be mocked; such as thou sowest, such shalt thou reap:"[e] which leads me to the consideration of my third head, viz. 'Justification by an imputative righteousness.'

The Justification of impure Persons, by an imputative Righteousness, refuted from Scripture.

'THAT there is no other way for sinners to be 'justified in the sight of God, than by the 'imputation of that righteousness of Christ, long 'since performed personally; and that sanctification 'is consequential, not antecedent.'

1. "Keep thee far from a false matter; and the "innocent and righteous slay thou not; for I will "not justify the wicked."[f] [Whereon I ground this argument, that since God has prescribed an inoffensive life, as that which can only give acceptance with Him, and on the contrary hath determined never to justify the wicked; then will it necessarily

[e] Gal. vi. 7. [f] Exod. xxiii. 7.

follow, that unless this so-much-believed imputative righteousness had that effectual influence, as to regenerate and redeem the soul from sin, on which the malediction lies, he is as far to seek for justification as before; for whilst a person is really guilty of a false matter, I positively assert, from the authority and force of this scripture, he cannot be in a state of justification; and as God will not justify the wicked, so, by the acknowledged reason of contraries, the just He will never condemn, but they, and they only, are the justified of God.]

2. "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that "condemneth the just, even they both are an abo-"mination to the Lord."[g] [It would very opportunely be observed, that if it is so great an abomination in men to justify the wicked, and condemn the just, how much greater would it be in God, which this doctrine of imputative righteousness necessarily does imply, that so far disengages God from the person justified, as that his guilt shall not condemn him, nor his innocency justify him? But will not the abomination appear greatest of all, when God shall be found condemning the just, on purpose to justify the wicked, and that He is thereto compelled, or else no salvation; which is the tendency of their doctrine, 'who imagine the righte-'ous and merciful God, to condemn and punish 'his innocent Son, that he having satisfied for our 'sins, we might be justified (whilst unsanctified) 'by the imputation of his perfect righteousness.' *O! why should this horrible thing be contended for by Christians?*]

3. "The son shall not bear the iniquity of his "father; the righteousness of the righteous shall "be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked "shall be upon him. When a righteous man

[g] Prov. xv. 13.

"turneth away from his righteousness, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die. Again, "when the wicked man turneth away from his "wickedness, and doth that which is lawful and "right, he shall save his soul alive; yet saith the "house of Israel, the ways of the Lord are not "equal: are not my ways equal?"[h] [If this was once equal, it is so still, for God is unchangeable; and therefore I shall draw this argument, that the condemnation or justification of persons is not from the imputation of another's righteousness, but the actual performance and keeping of God's righteous statutes or commandments, otherwise God should forget to be equal: therefore how wickedly unequal are those, who, not from scripture evidences, but their own dark conjectures and interpretations of obscure passages, would frame a doctrine so manifestly inconsistent with God's most pure and equal nature; making him to condemn the righteous to death, and justify the wicked to life, from the imputation of another's righteousness:—a most unequal way indeed!]

4. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, "Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, "but he that doth the will of my Father. Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth "them, I will liken him unto a wise man which "built his house upon a rock, &c."[i] [How very fruitful are the scriptures of truth, in testimonies against this absurd and dangerous doctrine! These words seem to import a twofold righteousness; the first consists in sacrifice, the last in obedience; the one makes a talking, the other a doing Christian. I in short argue thus: If none can enter into the kingdom of heaven, but they that do the Father's will, then none are justified, but

[h] Ezek. xxviii. 20, 26, 27, 28. [i] Matt. vii. 21, 24, 25.

they who do the Father's will, because none can enter into the kingdom but such as are justified; since therefore there can be no admittance had, without performing that righteous will, and doing those holy and perfect sayings; alas! to what value will an imputative righteousness amount, when a poor soul shall awake polluted in his sin, by the hasty calls of death, to make its appearance before the judgment-seat, where it is impossible to justify the wicked, or that any should escape uncondemned, but such as do the will of God?]

5. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall "abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love."[k] [From whence this argument doth naturally arise: If none are truly justified that abide not in Christ's love, and that none abide in his love who keep not his commandments; then consequently none are justified, but such as keep his commandments. Besides, here is the most palpable opposition to an imputative righteousness that may be; for Christ is so far from telling them of such a way of being justified, as that he informs them the reason why he abode in his Father's love was, his obedience; and is so far from telling them of their being justified, whilst not abiding in his love, by virtue of his obedience imputed unto them, that unless they keep his commands, and obey for themselves, they shall be so remote from an acceptance, as wholly to be cast out; in all which Christ is our example.]

6. "Ye are my friends, if you do whatsoever I "command you."[l] [We have almost here the very words, but altogether the same matter, which affords us thus much, that without being Christ's friends there is no being justified; but unless we keep his commandments, it is impossible we should

[k] John xv. 10. [l] John xv. 14.

be his friends: it therefore necessarily follows, that except we keep his commandments, there is no being justified: or, in short, thus; if the way to be a friend is, to keep the commandments; then the way to be justified is, to keep the commandments; because none can obtain the quality of a friend, and remain unjustified, or be truly justified whilst an enemy; which he certainly is that keeps not the commandments.]

7. "For not the hearers of the law are just before "God, but the doers of the law shall be justified."[m] [From whence how unanswerably may I observe, unless we become doers of that law, which Christ came not to destroy, but, as our example, to fulfil, we can never be justified before God; wherefore obedience is so absolutely necessary, that short of it there can be no acceptance; nor let any fancy that Christ hath so fulfilled it for them, as to exclude their obedience from being requisite to their acceptance, but as their pattern; "for unless ye follow "me," saith Christ, "ye cannot be my disciples:" and it is not only repugnant to reason, but in this place particularly refuted; for if Christ had fulfilled it on our behalf, and we not enabled to follow his example, there would not be doers, but one doer only, of the law justified before God. In short, if without obedience to the righteous law none can be justified, then all our hearing of the law, with but the mere imputation of another's righteousness, whilst we are actually breakers of it, is excluded, as not justifying before God. "If you fulfil the "royal law, ye do well; so speak ye, and so do ye, "as they that shall be judged thereby."]

8. "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but "if ye through the spirit, do mortify the deeds of "the body, ye shall live."[n] [No man can be

[m] Rom. ii. 13. [n] Rom. viii. 13.

dead, and justified before God, for so he may be justified that lives after the flesh; therefore they only can be justified that are alive; from whence this follows, if the living are justified and not the dead, and that none can live to God, but such as have mortified the deeds of the body through the spirit, then none can be justified but they who have mortified the deeds of the body through the spirit; so that justification does not go before, but is subsequential to the mortification of lusts, and sanctification of the soul, through the spirit's operation.]

9. "For as many as are led by the spirit of God, "are the sons of God."[o] [How clearly will it appear to any but a cavilling and tenacious spirit, that man can be no more justified, than as he becomes obedient to the Spirit's leadings; for if none can be a son of God, but he that is led by the Spirit of God, then none can be justified without being led by the Spirit of God, because none can be justified but he that is a son of God: so that the way to justification and sonship, is through the obedience to the Spirit's leadings, that is, manifesting the holy fruits thereof by an innocent life and conversation.]

10. "But let every man prove his own work, and "then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and "not in another. Be not deceived, for whatsoever "a man soweth that shall he reap."[p] [If rejoicing and acceptance with God, or the contrary, are to be reaped from the work that a man soweth, either to the flesh or to the spirit, then is the doctrine of acceptance, and ground of rejoicing, from the works of another, utterly excluded, every man reaping according to what he hath sown, and bearing his own burden.]

11. "Was not Abraham our father justified by "works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon

[o] Rom. viii. 14. [p] Gal. vi. 4, 7.

"the altar? Ye see then how that by works a "man is justified, and not by faith only."[q] [He that will seriously peruse this chapter, shall doubtless find some, to whom this epistle was wrote, of the same spirit with the satisfactionists and imputarians of our time—they fain would have found out a justification from faith in the imputation of another's righteousness; but James, an apostle of the most high God, who experimentally knew what true faith and justification meant, gave them to understand from Abraham's self-denying example, that unless their faith, in the purity and power of God's grace, had that effectual operation to subdue every beloved lust, wean from every Delilah, and entirely to resign and sacrifice Isaac himself, their faith was a fable, or as a body without a spirit: And as righteousness therefore in one person cannot justify another from unrighteousness; so whoever now pretend to be justified by faith, whilst not led and and guided by the Spirit into all the ways of truth, and works of righteousness, their faith they will find at last a fiction.]

12. "Little children, let no man deceive you, he "that doth righteousness is righteous, as God is "righteous, (but) he that committeth sin is of the "devil."[r] [From whence it may be very clearly argued, that none can be in a state of justification, from the righteousness performed by another imputed unto them, but as they are actually redeemed from the commission of sin: for "if he that committeth sin is of the devil," then cannot any be justified completely before God, who is so incompletely redeemed, as yet to be under the captivity of lust, since then the devil's seed or offspring may be justified; but that is impossible: it therefore follows, that as he who doth righteousness is righteous, as God is

[q] 1 James ii. 21, 24. [r] 1 John ii. 7, 8.

righteous, so no farther is he like God, or justifiable; for in whatsoever he derogates from the works of that faith, which is held in a pure conscience, he is no longer righteous or justified, but under condemnation as a transgressor, or disobedient person to the righteous commandment; and if any would obtain the true state of justification, let them circumspectly observe the holy guidings and instructions of that unction, to which the apostle recommended the ancient churches, that thereby they may be led out of all ungodliness into truth and holiness; so shall they find acceptance with the Lord, who has determined never to justify the wicked.]

Refuted from right Reason.

1. Because it is impossible for God to justify that which is both opposite and destructive to the purity of his own nature, as this doctrine necessarily obliges him to do, in accepting the wicked, as not such, from the imputation of another's righteousness.

2. Since man was justified before God, whilst in his native innocency, and never condemned till he had erred from that pure state; he never can be justified, whilst in the frequent commission of that for which the condemnation came; therefore, to be justified, his redemption must be as entire as his fall.

3. Because sin came not by imputation, but actual transgression; for God did not condemn his creature for what he did not, but what he did; therefore must the righteousness be as personal for acceptance, otherwise these two things will necessarily follow: first, that he may be actually a sinner, and yet not under the curse; secondly, that the power of the first Adam to death was more prevalent than the power of the second Adam unto life.

4. It is therefore contrary to sound reason, that if actual sinning brought death and condemnation, any thing besides actual obedience unto righteousness should bring life and justification; for death and life, condemnation and justification, being vastly opposite, no man can be actually dead and imputatively alive; therefore this doctrine, so much contended for, carries this gross absurdity with it, that a man may be actually sinful, yet imputatively righteous; actually judged and condemned, yet imputatively justified and glorified: In short, he may be actually damned, and yet imputatively saved; otherwise it must be acknowledged, that obedience to justification ought to be as personally extensive, as was disobedience to condemnation: in which real, not imputative sense, those various terms of sanctification, righteousness, resurrection, life, redemption, justification, &c. are most infallibly to be understood.

5. Nor are those words, *impute, imputed, imputeth, imputing*, used in scripture by way of opposition to that which is actual and inherent, as the assertors of an imputative righteousness do by their doctrine plainly intimate; but so much the contrary, as that they are never mentioned, but to express men really and personally to be that which is imputed to them, whether as guilty, as remitted, or as righteous: for instance: "What man soever of "the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, and bring-"eth it not to the door of the tabernacle, to offer "unto the Lord, blood shall be imputed unto that "man,"[s] or charged upon him as guilty thereof. "And Shimei said unto the king, let not my lord "impute iniquity unto me, for thy servant doth "know that I have sinned."[t]

[s] Lev. xvii. 4. [t] 2 Sam. xix. 18, 19, 20.

6. "But sin is not imputed where there is no "law."[u] From whence it is apparent that there could be no imputation or charging of guilt upon any, but such as really were guilty. Next, it is used about remission: "Blessed is the man unto whom "the Lord imputeth not iniquity;"[w] or, as the foregoing words have it, "whose transgression is forgiven." Where the non-imputation doth not argue a non-reality of sin, but the reality of God's pardon; for otherwise there would be nothing to forgive, nor yet a real pardon, but only imputative, which, according to the sense of this doctrine, I call imaginary. Again, "God was in Christ reconci-"ling the world unto himself, not imputing their "trespasses unto them."[x] Where also non-imputation, being a real discharge for actual trespasses, argues an imputation, by the reason of contraries, to be a real charging of actual guilt. Lastly, it is used in relation to righteousness, "Was not Abra-"ham justified by works, when he offered Isaac? "And by works was faith made perfect, and the "scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham be-"lieved God, and it was imputed unto him for "righteousness."[y] By which we must not conceive, as do the dark imputarians of this age, that Abraham's offering personally was not a justifying righteousness, but that God was pleased to account it so; since God never accounts a thing that which it is not; nor was there any imputation of another's righteousness to Abraham, but on the contrary, his personal obedience was the ground of that just imputation; and therefore, that any should be justified from the imputation of another's righteousness, not inherent, or actually possessed by them, is both ridiculous and dangerous——Ridiculous, since it is

[u] Rom. v. 13. [w] Psal. xxxii. 2. [x] 2 Cor. v. 19.
[y] James ii. 21, 22, 23.

to say a man is rich to the value of a thousand pounds, whilst he is not really or personally worth a groat, from the imputation of another, who has it all in his possession—Dangerous, because it begets a confident persuasion in many people of their being justified, whilst in captivity to those lusts, whose reward is condemnation; whence came that usual saying amongst many professors of religion, 'that God looks not on them as they are in themselves, but as they are in Christ;' not considering that none can be in Christ, who are not new creatures, which those cannot be reputed, who have not disrobed themselves of their old garments, but are still inmantled with the corruptions of the old man.

Consequences irreligious and irrational.

1. It makes God guilty of what the scriptures say is an abomination, to-wit, that He justifieth the wicked.

2. It makes Him look upon persons as they are not, or with respect, which is unworthy of his most equal nature.

3. He is hereby at peace with the wicked, (if justified whilst sinners) who said, "there is no peace "to the wicked."

4. It does not only imply communion with them here, in an imperfect state, but so to all eternity, "for whom He justified, them He also glorified."[2] Therefore whom He justified, whilst sinners, them He also glorified, whilst sinners.

5. It only secures from the wages, not the dominion of sin; whereby something that is sinful comes to be justified, and that which defileth, to enter God's kingdom.

[2] Rom. viii. 30.

6. It renders a man justified and condemned, dead and alive, redeemed and not redeemed, at the same time; the one by an imputative righteousness, the other a personal unrighteousness.

7. It flatters men, whilst subject to the world's lust, with a state of justification, and thereby invalidates the very end of Christ's appearance, which was to destroy the works of the devil, and take away the sins of the world; a quite contrary purpose than what the satisfactionists and imputarians of our times have imagined, viz. to satisfy for their sins, and by his imputed righteousness, to represent them holy in him, whilst unholy in themselves; therefore since it was to take away sin, and destroy the devil's works, which were not in Himself, for that Holy One saw no corruption, consequently in mankind; what can therefore be concluded more evidently true, than that such in whom sin is not taken away, and the devil's works undestroyed, are strangers (notwithstanding their conceits) to the very end and purpose of Christ's manifestation.

Conclusion, by way of Caution.

THUS, reader, have I led thee through those three so generally applauded doctrines, whose confutation I hope, though thou hast run, thou hast read; and now I call the righteous God of heaven to bear me record, that I have herein sought nothing below the defence of his unity, mercy, and purity, against the rude and impetuous assaults of tradition, press, and pulpit, from whence I daily hear, what rationally induceth me to believe a conspiracy is held by counter-plots, to obstruct the exaltation of truth, and to betray evangelical doctrines to idle traditions: but God will rebuke the winds, and destruction shall attend the enemies of his

anointed.——Mistake me not, we never have disowned a Father, Word, and Spirit, which are One, but men's inventions: for, 1. Their trinity has not so much as a foundation in the scriptures. 2. Its original was three hundred years after Christianity was in the world. 3. It having cost much blood; in the council of Sirmium, anno 335, it was decreed, 'that thenceforth the controversy should not 'be remembered, because the scriptures of God 'made no mention thereof.'* Why, then, should it be mentioned now, with a maranatha on all that will not bow to this abstruse opinion. 4. And it doubtless hath occasioned idolatry, witness the Popish images of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 5. It scandalizeth Turks, Jews, and Infidels, and palpably obstructs their reception of the Christian doctrine.——Nor is there more to be said on the behalf of the other two; for I can boldly challenge any person to give me one scripture phrase which does approach the doctrine of satisfaction, (much less the name) considering to what degree it is stretched; not that we do deny, but really confess, that Jesus Christ, in life, doctrine, and death, fulfilled his Father's will, and offered up a most satisfactory sacrifice, but not to pay God, or help him, (as otherwise being unable) to save men; and for a justification by an imputative righteousness, whilst not real, it is merely an imagination, not a reality, and therefore rejected; otherwise confessed and known to be justifying before God, because "there is no "abiding in Christ's love without keeping his com-"mandments." I therefore caution thee in love, of whatsoever tribe or family of religion thou mayest be, not longer to deceive thyself by the over-fond embraces of human apprehensions for divine mysteries; but rather be informed that God hath be-

* Socrat. Schol. An. 355. Conc. Sirm. cap. xxv. p. 275.

stowed "a measure of his grace on thee and me, "to shew us what is good, that we may obey and "do it:" which if thou diligently wilt observe, thou shalt be led out of all unrighteousness, and in thy obedience shalt thou "receive power to become a "Son of God;" in which happy estate God only can be known by men, and they know themselves to be justified before Him, whom experimentally to know, by Jesus Christ, is life eternal.

A Postscript of Animadversions, upon T. V.'s Contradictions, delivered in his Sermon from 1 John v. 4, *at the Evening Lecture in Spital-Yard:* "For whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the "World."

"WHatsoever is born "of God, over- "cometh the world."	'There is a two-fold 'victory; the first com- 'plete, the second in- 'complete.'

This is as well a contradiction to his text and doctrine, as to common sense; for besides that they neither of them say, 'He that is born of God, can- 'not perfectly overcome the world,' but much the contrary, I fain would understand his intention by an incomplete victory: if he mean not such a one as is obtained by the slaughter of every individual, but that which only does subdue the force, and lead captive their enemies, yet will the victory prove complete; for if they be so far overcome as to be disarmed of farther power to mischieve, the dispute is properly determined: but whatsoever is incomplete, is but overcoming, or in the way to victory, and victory is the completing of what was before imperfect,

'Such overcome as are 'born again, who are in 'Christ, that have cast off 'the old man, and know 'a change altogether new.	'Worldly lusts cannot 'be extirpated out of 'God's people in this 'world.'

If sin must have a place in them, how can they be born of God, and have a place in Christ, or cast off the old man, and know a change altogether new?

'God's children are 'the greatest conquerors; 'Alexander and Cæsar 'were conquerors, but 'these overcome their 'lusts.	'God's children can-'not perfectly overcome 'the lusts of this world, 'they sometimes take 'them captive.'

What strange divinity is this! that God's people should be conquerors, and yet captives; overcome the world, and yet be overcome thereby.

'Sin may tyrannize 'over believers.	'But not have domini-'on; it is in captivity; 'it is in chains.'

Who is so absolutely injurious, and incontroulable, as a tyrant? and notwithstanding that he should have no dominion, but be in captivity, and in chains, at best are Bedlam-distinctions, and consequently unworthy of any man's mouth that has a share of common-sense.

'You must kill, or be 'killed; either you must 'overcome the world, or 'the world you. 'If ye fight, ye shall 'overcome.	'Incompletely; he 'overcomes, when he 'breaks their force, leads 'them captive, and puts 'them into chains; but 'they are not at all slain, 'they sometimes take 'him captive.'

To kill or be killed, admits no middle way to escape; yet that both sin and God's children should

lead one another captive; and that he which fights shall overcome, and yet be in danger of being led captive, because completely a conqueror, to me seems very strange doctrine.

However, he goes on to tell them, 'Whosoever is 'born of God, overcometh the lusts of the world, 'and he that overcometh the lusts of the world, 'overcomes the devils of hell; God's children have 'to do with a conquered enemy.' Yet he would all this while be understood in an incomplete sense; and to excite all to fight for this incomplete victory, he recommended to their consideration the excellent rewards of conquerors, that is, "to him that "overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life, "the hidden manna. I will give him a white "stone, a new name, power over nations, white "raiment: yea, I will make him a pillar in the "temple of my God; he shall go no more out, and "I will grant him to sit with me in my throne." Admirable privileges, I acknowledge! but are they promised to incomplete conquerors? I judge not.

Reader, by this thou mayest be able to give a probable conjecture of the rest; and as I have begun with him and his co-disputants, with them I will end; who, notwithstanding all their boasts and calumnies against us, have so evaded those many opportunities we have offered them by letters, verbal messages, and personal visits, that had they any zeal for their principles, love for their reputation, or conscience in their promises, they would have been induced to a more direct and candid treaty.

But as it hath occasioned the publication of this little treatise, so I am credibly informed, through the too busy and malicious inquisition of some concerning it, (which have amounted to no less than positive reports) it is currently discoursed, how that a certain Quaker hath lately espoused the contro-

versy against R. F. and therein has perverted the Christian religion to that degree, as plainly to deny Christ's coming in the flesh; with much more than was fit to be said, or is fit to be answered.

But, reader, I shall ask no other judge to clear me from that most uncharitable accusation; since first, I am altogether unacquainted with R. F., nor ever did design directly such a thing, being unwilling to seek more adversaries than what more nearly seek the overthrow of truth, although I doubt not but this plain and simple treatise may prove some confutation of his sentiments.

And lastly, as concerning Christ; although the slander is not new, yet nevertheless false: for I declare on the behalf of that despised people, vulgarly called Quakers, the grace of which we testify hath never taught us to acknowledge another God than he that is the "Father of all things, who fills heaven "and earth:" neither to confess another Lord Jesus Christ, than he that appeared so many hundred years ago, "made of a Virgin, like unto us in all "things, sin excepted:" or any another doctrine than was by him declared and practised. Therefore let every mouth be stopped from ever opening more in blasphemy against God's innocent heritage, who in principle, life, and death, bear an unanimous testimony for the only true God, true Christ, and heavenly doctrine, which in their vindication is openly attested by

WILLIAM PENN, jun.

THE foregoing justly famous Tract I have thought proper to introduce into this Volume, with a view of promoting that general service for which it is so well adapted. By *some* among the Society of *Friends* it may have been too little known or noticed; while by *others* it probably has been wished fairly out of print. It is a manly, clear, and scriptural testimony to important truth, which must ever do its author credit for strength of reasoning, and religious integrity of mind. It is that kind of real unequivocal testimony to the Unity of the supreme God and Father, which can admit of no explanation into Trinitarian senses,—no compatibility with the *unscriptural* doctrine of the supreme eternal God-head of Jesus Christ. I am aware that the author has been supposed by writers of other societies, as well as by some of his friends, to have lessened his credit for *Unitarian* Faith by his subsequent explanations, particularly in his performance called "Innocency with her open Face." In this opinion, judging from the letter of some passages in both pieces, I confess I have been heretofore inclined to coincide; and I still think it would require more labour and ingenuity than could be useful, to shew by fair argument, adapted to general comprehension, the harmony of the two pieces! Such an existing ambiguity, if there be such, is not now to be prevented, or explained away; and for it I do not conceive it my business here to attempt an apology. Most certain I am, that no animadversions whatever can have the effect of shewing, that the plain force of the foregoing testimony can be in-

validated, either by less obvious senses of WM. PENN's own subsequent writings, or by the comments of others upon them. Coinciding, as ou due reflection I have been disposed to do, in a favourable opinion of *intentional consistency* of our able author, I am willing to admit this fully in his favour; I am willing to admit, what has been strongly contended for, that he was of too noble and independent a spirit, to have ever afterwards *intended* to invalidate the plain and conclusive arguments before laid down, for the entire unity and supremacy of "GOD the Father Almighty." Of course I cannot admit that WILLIAM PENN ever, subsequently, intended to be understood, that the supreme independent Being had originally any co-eternal, co-equal associate, or co-adjutor, in his own infinite designing mind or essence. And if *this* great scriptural doctrine be admitted, (as I hope never to see it denied or doubted among our friends, as a society) all doctrines of a contrary nature, and all casual deductions in favour of a plurality of original beings, or essences, or any sort of original triune existences, must fall to the ground. Taking these principles, then, as the solemn facts, I shall attempt nothing further on the subject, with regard to the exculpation of WM. PENN from any supposed inconsistency, than what briefly follows: That when using such strong phrases, as he has certainly done, concerning the Son of God, viz. That, with reference to the Father, he was "entirely the very same God,"—and "entirely the same one, holy, just, merciful, Almighty, and eternal God,"—he did not mean literally so in the common acceptation of language. It has also been thought that his explanations on this topic are among the most obscure and questionable that ever dropped from his pen. Those phrases might be sin-

cerely deduced in his own mind from temporary associations of mystical ideas, in his meditations on the divine attributes; and have been somewhat aided also by popular opinions of others; but they cannot be allowed to carry senses contradictory of himself; they cannot govern the more clear and uniform terms, in which he elsewhere, and very frequently, asserts the simple unity of the "Almighty "and eternal God." If we were to be bound to the strict literal import of such phrases of Wm. Penn, I know not how we should fairly get rid of certain serious consequences, which, in the opinion of common sense, have been made to attach to his words. As for example, "The same one, holy, "just, merciful, Almighty, and eternal God, took "flesh," and "was born of the Virgin." How should we fairly detach and refute an absurd and irreverent consequence, which has been said to be chargeable upon such statements? viz. that "according to such tenets, the *one, holy, just, merciful, Almighty,* and *eternal God,* became for a "season a poor impotent fleshy fœtus. Having "suspended his own original, glorious, infinite "existence, and supremacy over universal nature, "He subjected himself to a voluntary kind of "compression into the womb of a woman! there "to continue certain months; to be born an "helpless infant; to be laid in a manger; to be "carried about from place to place as a simple "child; to be circumcised; to grow in wisdom and "stature as a lad, and in favour with *himself* and "men; to work as a carpenter with his foster-"father, during about 30 years on earth; at 30 years "old to commence a public character, as a new "and divine Teacher of Righteousness; and three "years after to submit himself to be crucified be-"tween two thieves, calling for aid from his hea-

"venly Father and God, when (being himself de-
"fined as aforesaid) he could have none existing;
"to be buried in the earth; and then rising again
"to *return* to his deserted, proper character, as
"the "one, holy, just, merciful, Almighty, and
"eternal God," who nevertheless always gloriously
"filled immensity, and suffered no change!" I forbear to extend this painful quotation; the existence of which, or of any similar deductions from unscriptural premises, I exceedingly regret. I may be told, perhaps, that such instances of ridicule are too irreverent to be worth a refutation, or any serious answer; but this would be only a common-place, disingenuous, and useless way of setting aside a difficulty. I believe the writer of the above passage to have been a serious man, painfully affected with the causes of his remarks; and agree with him in deploring that such ambiguous commentaries on scripture doctrines, as he so strongly reprobates, should ever have found existence, so as to subject WILLIAM PENN, or any other good man, to the imputation of consequences which they must from their souls have abhorred.

Having thus done our deceased friend the justice to suppose, that in all he any where wrote, he *intended* that consistency in this article, which his many able works so generally breathe, I shall here dismiss the subject so far as concerns him.

As the authority of learned and serious men is of great consequence in settling opinions about disputed matters in theology, I shall in the next place reprint some extracts from the "Last Thoughts" of that learned and venerable author Dr. WHITBY, inclusive of his manly and ingenuous *Preface*.

W. M.

ΤΣΤΕΡΑΙ ΦΡΟΝΤΙΔΕΣ.

OR, THE

LAST THOUGHTS OF DR. WHITBY.

CONTAINING

His Correction of several Passages in his Commentary on the NEW TESTAMENT.

PREFACE.

IT is rightly and truly observed by *Justin Martyr*,[b] in the beginning of his Exhortation to the Greeks, 'That an exact scrutiny into things doth often produce conviction; that those things which we once judged to be right, are, after a more diligent enquiry into truth, found to be far otherwise.'

And truly I am not ashamed to say, *this is my very case*. For when I wrote my *Commentaries on the New Testament*, I went on (too hastily I own) in the common beaten road of other reputed *orthodox* divines: conceiving, *first*, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one complex notion, were one and the same God, by virtue of the same *individual* essence communicated from the Father.

[b] Orat. Cohort. ad Græcos, p. 1.

This confused notion I am now fully convinced, by the arguments I have offered here, and in the second part of my Reply to Dr. Waterland, to be a thing *impossible*, and full of gross *absurdities* and *contradictions*. And then, as a natural consequence from this doctrine, I *(secondly)* concluded that those divine persons differed only ἐν τρόπῳ ὑπάρξεως, *in the manner of their existence*. And yet what that can signify in the Son, according to this doctrine, it will not, I think, be very easy intelligibly to declare.

That the difference can be only *modal*, even Dr. South hath fully demonstrated; and that this was the opinion generally received from the fourth century, may be seen in the close of my first Part to Dr. Waterland. And yet Bishop Bull[c] positively affirms, 'That this is rank *Sabellianism* in these words, 'A *person* can't be conceived without essence, unless you make a *person* in divine matters to be nothing else but a mere mode of existence, which is manifest *Sabellianism*.' And the judicious Dr. Cudworth,[d] tells us 'That the *Orthodox Anti-Arian fathers* did all of them zealously condemn *Sabellianism*, the doctrine whereof is no other but this, That there is but one *Hypostasis*, or single individual essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and consequently that they were indeed but three *names*, or *notions*, or *modes*, of one and the self-same thing. Whence such absurdities as these would follow, That the Father's begetting the Son was nothing but a *name*, *notion*, or *mode* of one Deity begetting another; or else the same Deity under one notion begetting itself under another notion. And when again the

[c] Addo ego, Personam sine Essentia concipi non posse, nisi statueris Personam in Divinis nihil aliud esse quam merum τρόπον ὑπάρξεως. Quod plane Sabellianum, l. iv. p. 539.

[d] Cud. System, ch. iv. p. 605

'*Son* or *word* is said to be *incarnate*, and to have '*suffered* death for us upon the cross, that it was 'nothing but a mere *logical notion*, or *mode* of the 'Deity under one particular *notion* or *mode* only.'

That the doctrine of the *Sabellians* was exactly the same with that of those who stile themselves the *Orthodox*, asserting that the Father and the Son are numerically one and the same God, is evident from the words of *Athanasius*[e] and *Epiphanius:* both testifying,[f] That to say the Father and the Son were μονοούσιοι or ταυτοούσιοι, *of one and the same substance* was *Sabellianism*. And surely, of consequence, to contend that this is the doctrine of the church of England, is to dishonour our church, and in effect to charge her with that heresy, which was exploded with scorn by the whole church of Christ, from the third to this present century.

In a word, all other notions of the word *person*, besides the plain and obvious one, signifying a real and intelligent agent, have been already so excellently baffled and learnedly confuted,[g] that I own I am not able to resist the shining evidence of truth: nor am I ashamed to confess my former *mistakes* and *errors* in these matters after such strong and irresistible conviction, seeing, *humanum est errare*, all men are liable to error. And as upon this principle I cannot but think it the most gross hypocrisy, after such conviction, to persist in a mistake; so without question, it is the greatest abuse of humility and free-thinking, to attribute such open and ingenuous acknowledgements to a wavering judgment, or levity of mind.

[e] Ὀυτὲ γαρ υἱο πάτε ο φρονοῦμεν ὡς ὁι Σαβέλλιοι μοιοούσίον. Expos. Fidei, p. 241.

[f] Καὶ ὀυ λέγομεν ταυτοούσιον, ἵνα μὴ ἡ λέξις παρὰ τισι λεγομένη Σαβελλιῳ ἀπεικασθῇ. Anomeorum Heresis, 76. N. 7.

[g] See Dr. Clarke, Mr. Jackson, and others.

Neither are there wanting examples of good and great men amongst the antients to bear me out in this matter. St. Cyprian[h] frankly confesses, in his Epistle to Antonianus, that he was formerly in the rigid opinion of Tertullian, that the peace of the church was never to be given to *adulterers*, to *murderers*, and *Idolaters;* and having changed his opinion, he apologizes for it by saying, '*Mea apud* '*te & persona & causa purganda est, ne me aliquis* '*existimet a proposito meo leviter decessisse; et* '*cum Evangelicum vigorem primo et inter initia* '*defenderim, postmodum videar animum meum a* '*disciplina & censura priore flexisse.* And this honest procedure which he practised himself, he also approved in others, saying,[i] *Non quia semel erratum est, ideo semper errandum esse, cum magis sapientibus & Deum timentibus congruat, patefactæ veritati libenter et incunctanter obsequi, quam pertinaciter, atque obstinate reluctari;* that a man's having once erred is not a reason why he should continue to do so, for that it becomes wise men, and such as fear God, to yield freely and readily to truth, whenever made known to them, rather than to persist obstinately in rejecting it.

St. Austin was not more renowned for any of his works, than for his two books of *Retractations*, in which he confesseth all the errors he had committed in all his other writings.

And this my *retractation*, or change of my opinion, after all my former endeavours to assert and establish a contrary doctrine, deserves the more to be considered, because it proceeds (and indeed *can* proceed) from me for no other reason, but purely from the strong and irresistible convictions, which are now up on me, that I *was mistaken*.

[h] Epist. 55. [i] Epist. 73. Edit. Oxon. p. 208.

Nothing, I say, but the love of truth can be supposed to extort such a *retractation* from me, who having already lived so long beyond the common period of life, can have nothing else to do but to prepare for my great change; and in order thereunto to make my peace with God, and my own conscience, before I die. To this purpose I solemnly appeal to the Searcher of hearts, and call God to witness, whether I have *hastily* or *rashly* departed from the common opinion; or rather, whether I have not *deliberately* and *calmly* weighed the arguments on both sides, drawn from scripture and antiquity?

As I have no views for this world, so it cannot be imagined, that the motives drawn from interest, ambition, or secular glory, can have any place with me. Or if I had, neither can it be imagined that I would choose to dissent from the received opinion, the maintainers whereof are they who grasp honours and preferments, and think they have the best title to those advantages.

So that upon the whole, if I have erred in changing my opinion, I desire it may be observed, that my error hath neither prejudice, nor secular views to support it; and that my mistake (if such it will be reputed) hath been all along attended with constant prayers to the Throne of Grace, and what hath alway appeared to me to be the strongest reason and most undeniable evidence.

And even yet, if any will be so kind, as *in the spirit of meekness* to answer the arguments I have produced to justify my change, if it please God to give me the same degree of health and soundness of mind, which, by his blessing and goodness, I now enjoy, I promise sincerely to consider them, and to act suitably to the strength of the argument; but if any such answer is attempted with angry invec-

tives and haughty sophistry, aiming to be wise above what is written, I must say, μένωμεν ὥσπερ εσμὲν, i. e. *I must remain in my present sentiments;* having in this short Treatise seriously considered all that I had said in my *Commentary* to the contrary, and fully answered the most considerable places I had then produced for confirmation of the doctrine I there *too hastily* endeavoured to establish.

I conclude with those words of St. Austin—*Errare possum, hæreticus esse nolo;* that is, *I may err, but I will not be an heretick.* As yet I must be in St. Paul's sense,[k] if I would act against the dictates and strong convictions of my conscience. He having expressly said, that an heretick is one who is αὐτοκατάκριτος, condemned in his own conscience for what he doth assert. Now that the God of truth would give to me, and all others, a right understanding in all things, is the prayer of,

Your Friend, and Humble Servant,

DANIEL WHITBY.

[k] Titus iii. 10, 11,

DR. WHITBY'S

LAST THOUGHTS.

SECT. I.

IT is observable from scripture, and from the *Fathers* of the first three centuries, that whatsoever our blessed Lord is said to *have*, as to his nature or his attributes, he is said to have by the *donation* of the Father; or, as *received* from the Father; *v. g.* He has his *life* from the Father; for, as he himself saith, *As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me shall live by me*, John vi. 57; which cannot be understood of his resurrection, since it was spoken in the present tense; for he doth not say, I *shall* live, but I *live*. He hath his power to raise the dead from him, John v. 25, 26. For our Lord proves, *that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and live;* because, *as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.* And he hath also *given* him *power* to *judge* those whom he should thus raise: For, saith he, *The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, sent by him*, John v. 22, 24. *He hath given him* also *power over all flesh, to give to them whom God hath given him eternal life*, John xvii. 2. *He gave him all power in heaven and in earth*, Matt. xxviiii. 18.

Our Saviour also saith, *all that the Father hath is mine*, John xvi. 16. *Because the Father loveth*

the Son, and hath given all things into his hand, John iii. 35. *He is Lord of all,* Acts x. 36. *Because God made him both Lord and Christ,* Acts ii. 36, as St. Peter infers from God's raising him from the dead. *Him,* saith St. Paul, *hath God appointed heir of all things,* Heb. i. 2; *and hath given him to be head over all things to the church,* Eph. i. 22, and Phil. ii. 9. *He hath exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.* According to these words of the Psalmist, *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool,* Ps. cx. 1. *In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,* Col. ii. 9. *Because it pleased the Father that in him all fulness should dwell,* Col. i. 19. Agreeably to these scriptures, the *primitive fathers* give us an account of Christ's power and dominion as derived from the supreme God and Father of all things: as you may see in the agreement of the fathers with these sentiments. Sect. 3.

Secondly, all his offices are plainly dependent on, relating to, or received from the Father. The very nature of his prophetic office requires this, a prophet being one who is sent from God, and speaketh in his name. Whence he declares, during the execution of that office, that *he spake not of himself; but as the Father that sent him had given him a command, so he spake,* John xii. 49.

His priestly office doth also necessarily imply a relation to Him whom he was to atone and reconcile by the merits of his sufferings; which sufferings, say the scriptures, were undergone to reconcile us to God; *we being reconciled by the death of his Son,* Rom. v. 9. Which, by the way, shews that it is unreasonable and absurd to say it was the same individual Godhead that made satisfaction to

the offended person; for then, both being the same individual God, he must make satisfaction to himself: Whereas the scripture doth inform us, *that there is one Mediator*[1] *between God and man.* From whence *Eusebius*[1] infers that he is of a middle nature betwixt God and man.

As for his regal office, the scripture plainly testifies, that God hath *given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man,* John v. 26. And the Apostle tells us, *that God shall judge the world by Jesus Christ*, Rom. ii. 16. His power to confound all his enemies, and those of the church, is from that God, who said unto him, *Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.* His power to give eternal life to his faithful servants at the last day is given him of his Father, John xvii. 2. And when he hath thus crowned his servants, and put his enemies under his feet, then is he to give up the kingdom *to God the Father, that God may be all in all,* 1 Cor. xv. 28. The mighty works he did, were done by the Father, as the Baptist testifies in these words, John iii. 34, *For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.* He healed the sick that came unto him, *because the power of God was present to heal them,* Luke v. 17. He himself saith, *that the works which my Father hath given me [power] to do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me,* John v. 36. He also confesseth that he cast out devils *by the finger of God,* Luke xi. 20; that he did these works *by the spirit of God,* Matt. xii. 18. And again, *The Father*, saith he, *that dwelleth in me, He doth the works,* John xiv. 10. That he hath all his attributes also derived from the Fa-

[1] L. 1. Cont. Marc. p. 8.

ther, is generally acknowledged even by those who stile themselves the *Orthodox*. And of necessity it must be so, since all properties flow from the essence, and in reality are only the essence partially considered, or with relation to such powers. So that when the *individual* essence is *one* and the *same*, the actions and powers flowing from that essence must be the *same*. And hence they constantly assert, that the will, power, and wisdom,[m] of the whole Trinity is one and the same; and that what one wills, does, and knows, they all do, will, and know, by virtue of this unity of essence.

The primitive fathers of the first three centuries do also generally agree, that the Son received his power from the Father, as hath been observed already. And particularly Hippolitus,[n] *that his knowledge was given him by the Father:* to which the Orthodox are forced to say, that he received this power, this dominion, and these attributes, by receiving the same individual essence with the Father; which yet is a thing impossible in itself; since an individual essence cannot be communicated, for that very reason, because it is an individual, *i. e.* one and no more. Nor can three essences be one and no more, by being *connexe et conjuncte*, (as Tertullian's Thecla, or the spirit of Montanus taught him) but only three essences joined and connected to one another.

Moreover, hence it must follow, that the same numerical essence must be *self-existent* and *not* self-existent, *communicated* and yet *incommunicable*, (as a self-existing essence must necessarily be) generated and ungenerated, derived and underived: it being certain, that the Father's essence is

[m] Dr. W——d, p. 337.

[n] Πᾶσαν τὴν ἐπιςήμην παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς λαβὼν. Contra Noctum, p. 9.

self-existing, uncommunicated, and underived: and that the essence of the Son is not so. So that it must be an express contradiction to predicate these opposite and contradictory assertions of the same *numerical* essence. And hence it will follow, that this God must be *Deus de Deo*, and yet *Deus de nullo*; or, which is the same thing, a self-existing being; as he necessarily is in the Father, and yet he must communicate himself to another; who yet only is another, by having that essence communicated to him; and he must communicate himself unto another, by continuing invariably the same that he was before: To omit many other like absurdities. Accordingly a learned author very well observes, 'that as this doctrine would deprive both 'the Son and Holy Ghost of any proper essence 'and attributes of their own; so would it follow 'that they are only names.' For the same reason, neither can an individual power be communicated, as the same author proves in these words, 'The 'reason why the individual knowledge or power of 'God cannot be communicated, any more than his 'individual existence, is, because they are indivi-'dual, and nothing that is individual can ever be 'communicated from one thing to another.' *Ans. to Remarks, &c.* p. 230.

Thirdly, The essence of the Father being essentially an intelligent and active essence, and so a personal essence, it is evident, it cannot be communicated, unless a personal essence be communicated; and then the person to whom it is communicated must be two persons. From hence arise these corollaries.

First, that the Son is a real and distinct person from the supreme God. And also,

° Modest Plea continued, Ans. to Query 23, p. 50.

Secondly; That he is not of one and the same individual essence with him.

First; *He is a real person distinguished from him.* For Christ every where declares himself not to be the Father, but to come forth from him, to speak by his authority and commission, to do nothing of himself, but every thing by the power of the Father; nothing to his own, but every thing to his Father's glory.

And yet he speaks these things of himself considered as coming down from heaven; and with pronouns personal; and sometimes in opposition to the whole person of the Father, as when he saith, "He that believeth in me, believeth not in me (merely) but in him that sent me," John xii. 44.

Secondly; That he is not of the same individual, or numerical, essence with God the Father, is evident from these considerations:—

First, That where the numerical essence is one and the same, the will and actions of that essence must be one and the same. And where the will and actions are numerically distinct and diverse, there the individual essence must also be distinct and different. And this Damascen[p] declares to be the doctrine of the Fathers.

Hence it demonstratively follows, that if the essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be numerically one and the same, the will and all the other actions of these three must be numerically one and the same: so that what the Father wills and does, the Son and Holy Ghost must will and do also.

Now to shew the inconsistency of this with the plain declaration sof holy scripture, let it be considered,

[p] Ὁι Πατερες ὁι ἅγιοι ἔφασαν, ὧν ἡ ὐσία μία, τȣ̀των καὶ ἐνέργεια μία, και ων διαφορȣ ἡ ὐσία τȣτων διαφορος καὶ ἡ ἐνεργεια, c. xv. de Orthod. Fide, l. iii. p. 331; & c. xix. p. 255.

First, That if the essence of the Son (for instance) is one and the same with that of God the Father, his will must of necessity be one and the same with that of God the Father. And what the Father wills, the Son must of necessity will also; that is, the will of the Father must of necessity be his will too. But this is directly inconsistent with these words of Christ, John v. 20, "I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father that sent me."[q] And ch. vi. 38, "I came down from heaven, not that I might do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." And ch. iv. 34, "My meat is, that I may do the will of him that sent me, and that I may finish his work." For can the numerical essence send itself, and be sent by itself, and become his own legate? Neither can he that hath the same numerical will with the Father, come down from heaven not to do his own will. And here note, that all this is spoken of the will of him that came down from heaven, and therefore of the divine will of the Son.

Secondly; Where the individual essence is one and the same, the actions of that essence must be one and the same: so that what is done by the Father, must of necessity be done by the same individual essence of the Son, provided both have one essence. And yet this also is plainly inconsistent with the words of Christ, and with the declarations of holy scripture; as when Christ saith, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me," John vii. 16. Again, ch. xii. 49, 50, "The Father which

[q] Nec suam, sed Patris perfecit voluntatem, Tertul. ad. Prax. c. 8.

Ἕτερον ἑαυτὸν τοῦ Πατρὸς δείκνυται διατοῦ ἐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, καὶ οὐ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταλήλυθε θῆν νοῦν ἵνα ποιήσῃ τό θέλημα ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλα τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτ[illegible]. Euseb. Eccles. Theol. l. ii. c. 7, p. 110.

sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak: as the Father hath given me a commandment, so I speak."

[t]Now can the same individual essence send, and command itself? or could our Lord absolutely deny that doctrine to be his, which proceeded from his own numerical essence? If "I and the Father are one," signify one in essence, it must signify one in action also; and so what one sends, the other must send; what one commands, the other must also command; and the doctrine which one teacheth, must be taught by the other also.—Again; The works, saith he, which I do in my Father's name, that is, by his authority, and the work which my Father hath given me [power] to do, they bear witness of me, John v. 36. But how can one of the same individual essence with the Father act in *his* name, and not in his *own* also? Again; "As the Father had taught me, so I speak," John viii. 28. And, "the Father hath not left me alone, for I do always the things that are most pleasing to him." Now can one, of the same numerical essence with the Father, be taught by another, and not by himself? Or can he do those things which are pleasing to another and not to himself? In a word, if the essence of the Father and Son be one and the same, and consequently the actions flowing from that essence be one and the same in both; hence it demonstratively follows, that if to beget and to com-

[t]Alium dicam oportet, ex necessitate sensûs eum qui jubet, & eum qui facit. Nam nec juberet, si ipse faceret dum jubeter fieri per eum. Tamen jubebat haud sibi jussurus, si unus esset; aut sine jussu facturus, quia non expectasset ut sibi juberet.—*Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 12, & 9. Bonum placitum Patris Filius perfecit, mittit enim Pater, mittitur & venit *Filius*.—*Iræn.* l. iv. c. 14. Ο δὲ ἐντελλόμενῳ ἑτερῳ ἐντέλλεται τινι.—*Cons. Antioch. Sex Epis. Concil. tom.* i. *Ed. Lab. p.* 84.

[s] Vide *Euseb. de Eccles. Theol.* l. i. c. 20, p. 90.

municate an essence be to act, the Son must as truly beget and communicate his essence to himself, as the Father doth, and so must be both Father and Son to himself.

Thirdly; One *individual essence* can give nothing to and receive nothing from itself, because it can give nothing but what it hath already, and therefore cannot receive by way of *gift*. And this in an all-perfect and self-sufficient Being is the more certain, because it is incapable of any accession to its absolute perfection. If, then, God the Son hath the same numerical essence which the Father hath, he could not properly and truly say, Matt. xi. 17, [t] "All things are delivered to me by my Father." For could the Father either give or reveal any thing to his own essence, which it had not, or knew not before? And again, Matt. xxviii. 18, "All power is given to me in heaven and earth:" seeing the same essence must have always the same power. "The Father," saith Christ, "loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands," John iii. 35; even into the hands of that Son who came down from heaven, hath he given all things; not by communication of his own numerical essence to him, but from that affection which he bore to him. So again, "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he came down from heaven, washed the disciples' feet," John xiii. 3. And yet, if he that came down from heaven had the same numerical essence with the Father, he must give all

[t] Τὸ γαρ παρ ἑτέρȣ λȣμβάνον τί, ἔτ ρον παρὰ τȣ̃ διδόνλα νοεῖται.—Euseb. Eccles. Theol. l. iii. c. 4, p. 169. Πῶς δι ἀχώρις ὧν τȣ̃ θεȣ̃ ἐλυτȣ̃ ἔλεγεν ἀπεσάλθαι, ibid. l. ii. c. 20, p. 90; & plenius, l. ii. c. 7, p. 110. Nam nec qui accipit unus est cum dante, nec qui traditum accipit equalis est ei qui tradidit. Opus imperf. in Matth. p. 97.

things into his own hands, or give it to him who always had it. Again, John v. 22, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, even to that Son which he had sent down from heaven," v. 32, and therefore to him who had a Divine nature, by which alone he could be enabled to execute that judgment. And chap. xvii. 2, "Thou (Father, ver. 1.) hast given him (thy Son, *ibid.*) power over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to all that thou hast given him." An earthly parent may give the power to his son to give gratuities to his servants committed to him, because he is in essence numerically distinct from him: but were they numerically one in essence, the power of both must be one; and what was given, must be given by both. Lastly; Christ answers thus to the sons of Zebedee, [u]Matt. xx. 25, "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." And yet where the essence is one and the same, the gift must proceed from one and the same essence in both, and be prepared for them, to whom it is given by both.

Fourthly; The same numerical essence cannot send itself, or be sent from and return to itself. And yet how frequently doth our Lord inform us that the Father hath sent him into the world, and that he came forth from the Father? and came into the world? To select a few of his sayings: "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and He that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me," Matt. x. 40. John xiii. 20, "He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and

[u] Inter cujus non est, & inter cujus est, nec persona una est, nec æqualis potestas. Si Pater & Filius unus est, certé aut potest Filius, aut non potest Pater. Opus imperf. in Matth. Ho. 53. p. 128.

he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." In which words there seems to be a plain gradation from the lesser to the greater. "He that receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me," Mark ix. 37. "He that believeth in me, believeth not in me, but in him that sent me," John xii. 14. Could this negation be truly spoken by one and the same God with him that sent him? Is not the import of these words plainly this—He receiveth, or believeth, not only in me his messenger, speaking in his name, but in that God who sent me on his meesage? Is not this his own interpretation, when he saith, "The word which you heard, is not mine, but the Father's which sent me?" John xiv. 24. And is not this the import of the like phrases used both in the Old and New Testament? As when it is said, Exod. xvi. 8, "Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord." And 1 Sam. viii. 7, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me." Thess. iv. 8, "He that despiseth our commandment, despiseth not man, but God." Again chap. viii. 17, 18, Christ speaketh thus, "In your law it is written, the testimony of two men is true; I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me." Where observe, that the doctrine of the numerical unity of the Father and the Son in essence and in actions destroys Christ's argument, and turns it into a paralogism; for upon this supposition the Pharisees might have answered, that the testimony of two men might well be deemed the testimony of two witnesses, because they were as to nature numerically different, and their testimony contained two different actions, the testimony of one being not the testimony of the other; whereas the testimony of the Father and Son were only the same numerical action of them both; and so could not properly be said to be two testi-

monies. And John x. 37, "Say[w] you of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?" From this answer it is evident, first, that they accused our Lord of blasphemy, not for saying, ver. 30, "I and the Father are one," but for styling God his Father, and so in effect saying, he was the Son of God: for this is the reason of that accusation which our Lord here speaks of. Secondly; Our Lord here proves himself to be the Son of God, because the Father had sanctified him, and sent him into the world: whereas he who hath one numerical essence with the Father, must do the same action which the Father doth, and so must sanctify himself, and send himself into the world. Thirdly; He proves himself to be the Son of God, because he did the works of his Father; for so it immediately follows, ver. 38, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not to be his Son." Now these works, saith he, I do ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς, in my Father's name, that is, not by my own, but by his authority and power: whereas he who is numerically one in essence with the Father, must do his works by one and the same authority and power.

Fifthly; No numerical essence can do an action by another; for where the essence is the same, the action must proceed from the same essence, and so not be done by another. And yet it is expressly said, Ephes. iii. 9, That "God created all things by Jesus Christ." That "by him he made the worlds," Heb. i. 2. That "God will judge the

[w] Sanctificatum se a Patre proponit, dum ergo sanctificationem accipit a Patre, minor Patre est, minor autem Patre consequenter sed Filius. Pater enim si fuisset, sanctificationem dedisset, non accepisset; nunc autem profitendo se accipere sanctificationem a Patre, hoc ipso, quo Patre se minorem accipiendo ab ipso sanctificationem probat, Filium se esse, non Patrem monstravit.—*Novat.* c. 22.

secrets of men by Jesus Christ," Rom. ii. 15. "He that raised up the Lord Jesus Christ, shall raise us up also by Jesus," 1 Cor. iv. 14. "It pleased the Father by him to reconcile all things to himself," Col. i. 19, 20. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. vi. 11, 23. "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." And, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord," chap. vii. 25. And again, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus," Eph. iii. 21. And, "My God shall supply all your needs, according to his riches in glory, by Christ Jesus," Phil. iv. 19.

For the same reason, we could not, upon this supposition, properly be said to have things *from* God, or to do things *to* God, *by* Christ: To have "peace with God, παρα, by or through our Lord Jesus Christ," Rom. v. 1, 11. "To the only wise God be glory, παρα, by our Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. xvi. 27. "Thanks be to God who hath given us the victory, παρα, by our Lord Jesus Christ," 1 Cor. xv. 57. "Such hope have we to God, by Christ," 2 Cor. iii. 4. "We are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father," Phil. i. 11. "We give thanks, Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, to God even the Father by him, Col. iii. 17. "We offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. ii. 5. "That God in all things may be glorified, through Jesus Christ," chap. iv. 11. Now if Christ be the same only wise God, acting by the same individual essence, can glory be given to him by our Lord, and not by himself? Can our sacrifices be acceptable to God by him, and not also to him? Or can God in all things be glorified by himself? "By him," saith St. Paul, "let us offer up our sacrifices of praise to

God always," Heb. xiii. 15. And if he be the same individual essence, must they not be offered also to him, as well as by him?

In fine, it is observable, that though our modern writers do endeavour to prove from the miracles our Saviour did, that he was the same supreme God with the Father, yet Christ himself doth only use them to prove, that he was sent by the Father, and had commission from him to deliver this message to the world: as is evident from these words, John v. 36, "But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." And when he raised up Lazarus from the dead, he speaks thus to his Father, "Father, I know that thou hearest me always; but this I said that they (the Jews) might believe that thou hast sent me," John xi. 42.

Secondly; Hence it is certain, that there can be no communication, internal production, or necessary emanation of the individual essence of the Father to the Son.

First; Because, as I have already proved, an individual essence cannot be communicated; and also because a particular essence, subsisting by itself, in intelligent beings, as the essence of the Father is, is the same as a person, and therefore cannot be communicated without the communication of the person; and yet it is on all hands granted, that the person of the Father, as a self-existing being, was not, and cannot be, communicated to the Son.

Secondly; Internal production, that is, production in the essence of the Father, is indeed no production at all. For since this internal production is said to give to the son no distinct existence of its own, it is manifest it is a production of nothing,

that is, no production at all; for that which hath no existence of its own, is not produced. Nor,

Thirdly, Can the son's essence be produced by necessary emanation. 1. Because such emanation, and the essence from which it emaneth, would both be as equally self-existent, as it is equally necessary for God to be an intelligent being, and to be at all. For whatever necessarily and essentially belongs to that which is self-existent, is itself self-existent, as being indeed only the very same thing apprehended under a partial consideration.

2. Because it is the general doctrine of the Anti-Nicene fathers, that the Son was produced by the will of the Father. This is expressly taught by Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Hippolytus, and Novatian. And, saith Eusebius, it is that doctrine which οἱ σοφώτατοι τῶν Πατέρων ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις συντάγμασιν ἀπεφήναντο, *is that doctrine which the wisest of the fathers declared in their genuine works,* Eccless. Theol. l. i. p. 20. And the same father puts this difference betwixt the emanation of light from the sun, and the generation of the Son of God; that the first results necessarily from the nature of the sun, it being of necessity that all luminous bodies should send forth rays of light. But that the Son was the image of the Father κατὰ γνώμην καὶ προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ, according to his *council* and *choice*.[x]

A necessary emanation from the Father by the will and power of the Father is an express contradiction; because necessity, in its very notion, excludes all operation of will and power, though it may be consistent with approbation. See all this fully proved in the Agreement of the Fathers, section 4th: and in my Answer to Dr. W., part ii. from p. 19 to p. 22.

[x] Demon. Evang. l. iv. c. 3, p. 147, 148.

Lastly; It is observable, that in Irenæus's time the way of expressing the proceeding of the Son from the Father seems not to have been determined by any decision of the church, but only by the Valentinian hereticks, as seemeth plain from the words of Irenæus: "The Valentinians (saith he) "are *irrationabiliter inflati*, unreasonably puft up, "by pretending to know the unspeakable mysteries "of the generation of Christ." And if any man "asks, (saith he) *Quomodo Filius a Patre prolatus* "*est?* *Nemo novit, dicemus ei, nisi solus qui gene-* "*ravit Pater, & qui natus est Filius:* How the "Son proceeds from the Father, whether by pro-"lation, or generation, or by declaration, or by "whatsoever name it be called; we answer, "No one knows but the Father who begat, and "the Son who was begotten of him."

Fourthly; Hence it follows, that Christ must be (in a certain sense) truly God, because he hath dominion over all flesh, and all power in heaven and in earth *imparted* to him. For this dominion is the ground of divine worship and authority: According to that aphorism, *Deus est qui dominium habet, summus summum, verus verum, falsus falsum*, "He is God who has dominion; he is the supreme God, who has the highest and underived dominion; a true God, who has true dominion over all things; a false God, who falsely pretends to that dominion which he has no right to exercise." And to this we may refer those words, Heb. iii. 3, 4, ὁ δὲ κατασκευάσας τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεός, "He that governs all things is God." See the note there. Our blessed Lord, therefore, having true dominion over all things in heaven and earth, must be (so far forth) truly God. And that his dominion is given and committed to him by the Father, doth not render him

[y] L. ii. c. 48, p. 176. Ed. Grab.

less truly God; because the word *God* being a a relative term, it is not the metaphysical nature, but the exercise of dominion that constitutes him *a God* to us. And this dominion he ascribeth to himself in these words, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:" And hence infers that "all men should honour the Son, even (as truly) as they honour the Father that sent him;" and adds, "he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that sent him." Accordingly, Origen saith, the heathens can shew no *command* for worshipping *Antinöus*, or any of their other Gods. Whereas the Christians have an express command,[z] from the most high God to worship (or honour) Christ, viz. those words, that *all men should honour the Son*, &c. And again; The Maker of the world commended Jesus Christ to the breasts of all Christians, to be honoured with divine honour, not for his unity of essence with him, but for the efficacy of his wonderful doctrine. Novatian[a] saith, "That God the Father is justly "stiled the God over all, and the original, even of "the Son himself whom he begat, Lord of all; "and also, that the Son is the God of all other "things subject to him." Accordingly, St. Paul teacheth us, "That God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11. And accordingly, Irenæus[b] saith in the forecited passages, that "Christ "is *verè Deus & Dominus*, truly God and Lord;"

[z] Ἀποδείξομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ δέδοται αὐτῷ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι. Contra. Celsum, l. viii. p. 384.

[a] L. xxi. p. 730. [b] L. iii. c. 6.

though he owned he received his dominion over all creatures from the Father.

Fifthly; Hence it is evident, that Jesus Christ must have received, as the foundation of this dominion, all power necessary to the exercise thereof, since it is unreasonable to conceive, that an all-wise God should have given that power to him, which he had not enabled him to execute; and therefore, that his Providence must reach to the government and direction of all creatures, "all things being made subject unto him;" and that he must have the largest power, "for He hath put all things under his feet," 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28, 29. For from this power *given* by the Father, "to have life in himself," he infers, "that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and live," John v. 25, 26. And hence St. Paul informs us, "That he shall change our vile bodies into the likeness of his glorious body, according to the mighty power whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself," Phil. iii. 21. He being appointed to be the Judge of quick and dead, must have the knowledge of the hearts of those whom he is to judge, that so he may judge of all men according to their works. And therefore this knowledge he ascribes to himself in these words: "All the churches shall know that I am he who searcheth the reins and the hearts, and will give to every one according to his works," Rev. ii. 23. Now to him who hath the knowledge of the hearts of all them who pray unto him, who hath dominion over all things in heaven and earth, who is able to raise the dead with glorious bodies, who hath power over all flesh to give eternal life to them that believe in him, and to punish all who obey not his gospel, and to reward every man according to his works, doubtless we have sufficient ground to pray to, as well as to believe, hope, and trust in him,

and to depend upon him for all the blessings we can want, and he is able to confer upon us. Thus therefore we are to honour the Son, like as we honour the Father that sent him, and hath given all power into his hands.

Now from what hath been thus discoursed, we learn two reasons why our blessed Lord may be truly stiled God.

First, By reason of his divine excellencies, he having derived from the Father the like excellencies to those by which the Father himself doth govern the world, and exerciseth his divine power over all things, viz. a Providence ruling over all things, a right to judge all men, and a knowledge of the secrets of the hearts of them whom he is to judge.

And hence most of the Anti-Nicene fathers say, that he is εἰκὼν τῆς Πατρικῆς Θεότητος, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. *the image of the Father's deity, and therefore God.*

Secondly, Because he hath dominion over all things in heaven and earth, and God hath put all things under his feet. For seeing God hath given that very dominion which He himself exerciseth, into the hands of the Son, he must have thereby constituted him truly God and Lord over us. And though he was qualified for this dominion before by his divine excellencies, he could not have them given him before there was an heaven and an earth, over which he should have dominion.

Hence even of God the Father, Tertullian saith,[c] "Though he was always God, he was not always Lord, *nam ex quo esse cæperunt in quæ potestas Domini ageret, ex illo per accessionem potestatis, & factus, & dictus est Dominus.* And again, *Sic & Dominus non ante ea quorum Dominus existeret, sed Dominus tantum futurus quandoque per ea quæ sibi servitura fecisset.* He was not Lord,

[c] Contra Hermog. c. iii. p. 234.

nor to be called so, till he had made those creatures over which He was to have dominion. Hence,

Sixthly, It follows, that the Son of God must be truly *inferior* to God the Father, and the Father truly *superior* to him; since he who receiveth all his power and excellencies from the Father, and hath them all derived from him in whom they are self-existent and underived, he who is sent by, and is obedient to his Father's will, must be *inferior* to him who sent him.[d] And hence it follows, that the worship due unto him, though it be divine, is *inferior* worship, as being the worship of one to whom the Father hath given all dominion both in heaven and earth. In heaven; "For when God brought forth his first-begotten into the world, He said, Let all the angels of God worship him," Heb. i. 6. And St. Peter informs us, "That angels, authorities, and powers, are made subject unto him, 1 Pet. iii. 22. In earth; "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that sent him," John v. 22, 23.

Now hence it is plain, that because Christ was the Son of Man, therefore the Father gave him authority to execute judgment, or committed all judgment to him. And because God gave him authority to execute judgment, therefore all men should honour him even as they honour the Father, that is, in other words, Christ's honour and worship are founded upon the Father's gift: And the reason of the Father's giving it was his becoming the Son of Man. Surely, then, the most high God must be superior to the Son of Man; and He that gave this.

[d] Τὸ γὰρ ὑπακούειν τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ, υἱὸν γενομένῳ ἀν προσώπων παρασατικον. Eus. Ecc. Theol. l. i. c. 20, p. 94.

honour to him, must be superior to him who received it from him as his gift.

Hence St. Paul informs us, "that God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11. Now he who is made Lord, to the glory of God the Father, cannot be the same Lord with God the Father; since then he must be Lord and God to his own glory. All that Dr. Waterland offers, to evade the force of this text, is fully considered and confuted by the ingenious author of the unity of God, in his Answer to the Dr.'s Remarks, p. 38. But against this Dr. Waterland objects these words of Irenæus,[e] *Qui super se habet aliquem superiorem, & sub alterius potestate, est hic neque Deus, neque magnus Rex, dici potest;* that is, He that hath another superior to him, and is under the power of another, cannot be called God, or a great King. Not considering, or rather unduly concealing, that these words were spoken against the heresies of the Valentinians and Marcionites, who not only held that there was another superior to that God who made the world, but that the God who gave the law was *only just, but not good;* and that this superior God sent Jesus to annul what he had done. Irenæus saith, they called him moreover, *Malorum Fabricatorem,*[f] the Maker of evil things. And that Jesus was sent by that Father, *qui est super mundi fabricatorem Deum,* who was superior to God the maker of the world, to dissolve the law and the prophets, *& omnia opera ejus Dei qu*

[e] L. i. c. 29, p. 104. [f] L. iv. c. 5, p. 278.

mundum fecit,[g] and all the works of that God who made the world. And well might Irenæus say, that he that hath thus a superior, and is so far under the power of another, as to destroy all that he had done, and pronounces him a wicked being, can neither be truly God, nor a great King. But yet this hinders not, but that he who hath a power over all things committed to him from the Father, who acts by his authority, and always agreeably to his will, may be truly God: He being, as Eusebius truly saith, εἰκων τῆς πατρικης θεότητος, καὶ δια τȣ̃το Θεός, *The image of the Father's deity, and therefore God.*

Moreover, the fundamental principle of the Protestant religion is this,—*That the Holy Scriptures contain a sufficient clearness in all things necessary to be believed, or done in order to salvation.*

Whence it clearly follows, that what is not with sufficient clearness contained in the scripture, cannot be truly deemed a necessary article of Christian faith, or a doctrine necessary to be believed unto salvation.

Hence, therefore, I think it may rationally be enquired,

First, Where hath the scripture said, *that the individual essence of the Father hath been communicated to the Son and Holy Ghost, or that they derive the same individual essence* ἐξ ȣ̃σίας τȣ̃ Πατρὸς, *from the essence of the Father, or have the same individual essence with him, and so are the same one God?*

Secondly, Where hath the scripture said, *that the Son proceedeth from the Father by a necessary emanation?* Or,

Thirdly, *By an internal production within the essence of the Father;* though that seems plainly

[g] Lib. i. c. 29, p. 104. Cont. Marcel. l. ii. c. 23, p. 141; l. i. c. 2, p. 61, 62.

necessary to be asserted by those who call themselves *Orthodox;* since, if he be produced *extra essentiam Patris,* he must have another essence from that which is the Father's.

Fourthly, Where hath it any where spoken *any thing of the wonderful emperichoresis of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,* which the Post-Nicene fathers speak of with so much confidence and assurance?

Fifthly, Where hath the scripture plainly spoken any thing of the ἕνωσις ὑποστατικὴ, or *hypostatical union,* broached first by Cyril of Alexandria, and by Theodoret[h] pronounced to be a thing unknown to the fathers that lived before him?

Sixthly, Where hath it said, *that the Holy Ghost essentially proceeded from the Father and the Son?*

Seventhly, Where hath it declared, *that all or any of these things are necessary to be believed in order to salvation, as the Pseudo-Athanasian Creed* doth? Or by what authority do men come after him, and declare that necessary which God hath never made so? This being plainly to add unto God's word, and to usurp the authority of that one Legislator and Judge, "who alone is able to save and to destroy." James iv. 12. What is this, but without Divine authority rashly to exclude men from heaven, and sentence them to hell; and to usurp the authority of that God, whom we are only to call *Father upon earth,* and *of that Jesus* who is our only *guide* and *teacher,* in opposition to all other teachers?

Eighthly, Where do the scriptures say, *that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have only one and the same individual will, or that all three in one com-*

[h] Τὴν δὲ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν παντάπασιν ἀγνοοῦμεν ὡς ξένην, καὶ ἀλλόφυλον τῶν θείων γραφῶν, καὶ τῶν τούτας ἡρμηνευκότων Πατέρων.—Reprehen. tom. iv. p. 709.

plex notion do one and the same indixidual action? The falshood of which assertion I have elsewhere proved. And,

Lastly, Where do the scriptures say, *that three persons can subsist in one numerical essence?* This being in effect to say, as Dr. Waterland doth not blush to do, *that three intelligent agents may be one intelligent agent, and no more?*[i] Had all these things been necessary to have been believed, surely they would have been, either in express words, or plain consequence, contained in the holy scripture. And if they cannot be found there, it must be granted, at least by all Protestants, that they are not necessary to be believed, as not being contained in their rule of faith.

In our discourses with the doctors of the Roman communion, we distinguish betwixt such articles as we call *positive* or *affirmative*, or which we do assert to be delivered in that scripture which is our rule of faith, (and that these are contained in scripture, we own ourselves obliged to prove;) and those which we call *negative*, or such as we deny to be contained in our rule of Faith:—As that the Pope is Christ's vicar upon earth; *That the Host is transubstantiated into the real body and blood of Christ, united to his divinity, and therefore is to be worshiped with Latria, that is, with worship only due to the great God of heaven:* That *it is to be offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living, or the dead: That saints and angels are to be worshipped by mental or oral prayers: That we are to bow down to or worship images or crucifixes: That the sacraments of the New Testament are seven: That prayers are to be offered for the dead, to free them from the pains of purgatory: That prayers are to be administered in Latin, though it be an unknown tongue to the people:*

[i] Defence, p. 250.

And lastly, *That general councils are infallible;* and *that priests do formally forgive sins, and not declaratively only.*

Now as to these *negative propositions,* we declare we are not obliged to prove from scripture, that it doth expressly deny them, but think it sufficient, that we do not find them contained in our rule of faith: because whatsoever is of divine revelation, must be contained in these scriptures, in which we have the mind of God fully revealed to us. From whence it follows, that if we would act agreeably to our fundamental principle, we also must reject all other pretended articles of Christian faith, which cannot be sufficiently proved to be contained in the holy scriptures.

It is a true and excellent saying of one of the antients, that *Deus non ducit ad cœlum per difficilia,* that God brings not men to heaven by difficult matters. And seeing "God would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth," necessary to that end, 1 Tim. ii. 4; and since the gospel was indited for the salvation of all men in general, Greeks and barbarians, wise and unwise; and seeing St. Paul declares, that in preaching it, they used "great plainness of speech," 2 Cor. iii. 12; seeing, lastly, our excellent Homily[k] on this subject teacheth us, *That there is nothing spoken in dark mysteries in one place of scripture, but the same thing is more familiarly and plainly taught in another, to the capacity both of the learned and unlearned; and those things which are plain to understand, and necessary for salvation, every man's duty is to learn them.* And seeing also, all the ancient *fathers* expressly and frequently say the same thing, as I have proved elsewhere.[l] Hence

[k] Hom. 1st.

[l] Defence of Bishop Bangor's Prop. p. 36, 37, 38.

it is very evident, that not only the niceties contained in the *Pseudo-Athanasian Creed*, cannot be necessary to be believed unto salvation, as the author of that Creed thrice asserts, because some of the unlearned laiety cannot understand them; but also that the propositions mentioned by me, as not clearly contained in scripture, cannot be necessary to be believed in order to that end; since by experience we find that even learned *clerks* are so exceedingly divided, and so eagerly dispute concerning the truth or falshood of them: Some saying that they are not only true, but also necessary to be believed; and others, as sincerely honest and upright in their enquiries after truth, asserting, not only that they are false, but that they are obnoxious to many contradictions and absurdities; which is a certain demonstration that they are not delivered in holy scripture with that clearness of speech which St. Paul mentions, and much less without great difficulties, surmounting the capacity of the unlearned. Again,

It seems to me very considerable, that the wisdom of our blessed Lord, of the Holy Ghost, and of the sacred writers, should be so full, copious, and frequently express, in things necessary to be done in order to salvation; and yet be so sparing, or rather silent, as to the articles pretended to be as necessary to be believed unto salvation. Since all wise agents, truly desirous of the salvation of them whom they instruct, will be as much concerned that they should know what is necessary to be believed, as what is necessary to be done, in order to salvation.

Nor can salvation be obtained by our obedience to what is necessary to be done in order to salvation, without the knowledge of what is necessary to be believed to the same end.

And yet it seemeth evident, that the *holy scriptures*, and *inspired penmen* of them, who have so fully taught us all things necessary to be done in order to salvation, have been comparatively silent in reference to these articles, pretended to be as necessary to be believed to the same end. For instance,

Our blessed Saviour, in his excellent Sermon on the Mount, concludes with these words, "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him to a man which built his house upon a rock."

Whence it is evident, that they who did those sayings, must be wise unto salvation. In the very beginning of that sermon he pronounceth "the pure in heart blessed, for they shall see God; the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven; they that mourn, for they shall be comforted; the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy; the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God; they who are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven:" though in all that whole sermon he taught them nothing of these propositions. Now, either it must be said, that no man can be poor in spirit, pure in heart, truly merciful, true mourners, true peace-makers, or truly sufferers for righteousness sake, unless they do assent to those propositions, (and then wonderful is it, that he who said those things to the "Jews that they might be saved," should in this long discourse speak nothing of them;) or else it must be certain from our Saviour's words, that they may be blessed, who do not believe them. In the same sermon he saith also, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

Now sure it would be very hard to say, that no man could sincerely do the will of God, who does not firmly believe all the fore-mentioned propositions, of which our Saviour speaketh not one word; and yet more hard to think that he should not only know them to be as necessary to be believed, as any one thing he had taught was to be done, and yet say nothing of them; but also say unto his Father, "This is life eternal, to know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." And,

Lastly, Our Saviour says, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you," John xv. 14; and promised, ver. 10, that "if we keep his commandments, we shall abide in his love; and that he will give to them that hear his voice, eternal life." Since he hath said, "that they who know his precepts, shall be happy if they do them; that he who hath his commandments, and keepeth them, is one that loveth him; that if any one loveth me, he will keep my sayings, and the Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him," John xiv. 23: it must be certain that they who yield sincere obedience to his laws, shall be for ever happy.

Now what can be conceived necessary to the performance of this obedience, besides sufficient power to do what is commanded, and the most strong and powerful inducements to engage us so to do? Seeing the first must make us able, the second must be sufficient to make us willing, to do what is required of us. Since therefore it is certain, that a just and gracious Lawgiver cannot require us, on pain of his severe displeasure, to do what *he will* not enable us to perform; and since it is as certain, that the promise of eternal life, that is, the promise of the greatest and most lasting blessing that we can en-

joy, must be sufficient to make us willing to do what we are able:—it must be also certain, that the divine assistance, which God will certainly afford to all that do sincerely ask it, that they may be strengthened in the inward man to do his will; and that a firm assurance of that eternal life, which he hath promised to them that do so; must be all that is necessary to the performance of that obedience, to which Christ hath annexed the promise of eternal happiness.

St. John concludeth the history of his gospel in these words; "There are many other things which Jesus did, which are not written in this book; but these things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name;" plainly declaring that eternal life may be obtained by a plain belief that Jesus is the Christ, and a life suitable to that faith. Where by the way we are to observe, that he spake this of the belief, not of the *Godhead* of Jesus Christ; but of the deeds done by him, which as he himself saith, bear witness *that the Father hath sent him*, and therefore that he was the Christ.

Agreeable to this, saith the Apostle Paul, "This is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, that Jesus Christ is Lord; and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved," Rom. x. 8, 9. Because by owning him as our Lord, we own our obligation to yield obedience to his commands; for "why," saith he, "call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" And the belief of his resurrection affords the highest motives to perform it, "we being," saith St. Peter, 1 Eph. i. 3, "begotten by his resurrection from the dead, to a lively hope of an inheritance incorruptible and

undefiled, that fadeth not away, reserved in the heavens for us."

Now from this principle, that a rule prescribed by an all-wise God, to teach the most simple, rude, and ignorant, as well as the wise and prudent, what is necessary for them to believe, and do, in order to salvation, must be plain, and easy to be understood by the most simple and illiterate; it follows,

First, That it is repugnant to the wisdom of God, to require any thing as necessary to be believed, which is dubious and obscure in scripture; since that would be to propound that as a means for obtaining an end, which he knew to be insufficient to obtain it; it being certain, that what is dubious and obscure in scripture, cannot afford us a certain knowledge of our duty.

Secondly, It also seems repugnant to the goodness of God to perplex and confound weak minds with such subtleties, for the knowledge of which he has not given them suitable qualifications; seeing, as St. Paul observes, "God accepteth, according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not," 2 Cor. viii. 12. Now it is evident, from the continual clashings of our most learned divines about these subtleties, that the *illiterate* can have no certain knowledge of the truth or falshood of them.

Thirdly, It seemeth inconsistent with the justice and righteousness of God, to require any man to believe what he does not or cannot understand; for no man can be said to believe, that is, assent to, what he does not understand; because assent is an act of the understanding, and we must understand the meaning of every term in a proposition, before we can assent to it, or dissent from it; for words of which we do not understand the meaning, are the same to us, as if they had no signification at all;

A righteous God puts upon no man the *Ægyptian task, of making brick without straw;* nor requires any thing of us in order to our salvation, which we cannot perform; that being in effect to require impossible conditions of salvation from us.

In fine, belief, or disbelief, can neither be a virtue, nor a crime, in any one who uses the best means in his power of being informed. If a proposition is evident, we cannot avoid believing of it; and where is the merit or piety of a necessary assent? If it is not evident, we cannot help rejecting it, or doubting of it; and where is the crime of not performing impossibilities, or not believing what does not appear to us to be true? If I have done my best endeavour to know the mind of God revealed in scripture, I have done all I could, and therefore all that God requires of me in order to that end. Can then a good and gracious God be angry with me, or condemn me for my unwilling mistakes, when I have done all that was in my power to avoid them?

In fine, it is observable that the very nature of a *prophet* requires this, that he should be a person sent from God, and not speaking in his own, but God's name. Hence concerning the false prophets God speaks thus, "I have not sent them, yet they run; I have not spoken unto them, yet they prophesy," Jer. xxiii. 21. And again, chap. xiv. 14, "Then the Lord said unto me, the prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake I unto them; they prophesy unto you a false vision.

Hence our blessed Lord having said, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." He also adds, John vii. 17, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself:" That is, whether I be a true or a false *prophet.* This being

the established notion of a prophet; and our Saviour being that prophet, which Moses told them should come after him, and which was promised to the Jews, he must perform that office, as other prophets did, by speaking not in his own name, but in the name of him that sent him.

Accordingly, during his prophetic office here on earth, he says, that "he spake not of himself, but as the Father that had sent him had given him a commandment, so he spake," John xii. 49. and chap. xiv. 24, "The word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me:" and ver. 31, "As the Father gave me a commandment, even so I do."

And lastly, The *prophetical revelations* made to St. John, in the *Apocalyps*, are stiled "the Revelations of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass."

Now hence it follows, that the accusations of the Jews must be false, malicious, and scandalous accusations, seeing he who came into the world, as a prophet sent from God, one speaking not in his own, but in his Father's name, and declaring that his doctrine was not his, but his that sent him, could never say at the same time, that he was the very God that sent him, that he spake not in his own, but in the name of God, and delivered not his own doctrine, but that of him that sent him. It being certain, that the *supreme God* could not be the person sending, and yet the person sent; he could not speak in the name of another, nor say his doctrine was not his.

Hence it is remarkable, that in all those places, in which the Jews accused him of blasphemy, and making himself God, or *equal* with God, or ascribing to himself what properly belonged to the great

God alone, he never directly answers, that he was God, or equal to him, (although if he were sent preach that doctrine to the world, it is reasonable to expect upon these occasions he would have done it) but he ever speaks as one who waved that assertion.

For when the Scribes enquire, "Why doth this man speak blasphemy? Who can forgive sins but one, that is, God?" Mark ii. 7; he doth not answer as others do for him, that this proved him to be God; but only saith, "The Son of Man hath power upon earth to forgive (the temporal punishment of) sin." Ascribing to himself that power, not as he was the Son of God, much less as being God of the same essence with the Father; but only as he was the Son of Man; Again, from these words, John v. 17, "My Father worketh hitherto," works of providential care, goodness, and mercy, "and" these charitable actions, "I work also." From these words, I say, of his calling God his Father in so peculiar a manner (as he did, and had just cause to do, had he only been miraculously conceived in the Virgin's womb, and upon that account "the Son of God," Luke i. 25, "the Son of the most High," v. 32) they invidiously infer, ver. 18, that "he called God πατέρα ἴδιον," that is, "his Father," in such a proper sense, as made him equal to God, as a Son is to his Father.

Now to this Christ doth not answer, as it might have been expected from one who was sent into the world to confirm that doctrine, to-wit, that he had reason thus to call God his Father, as being of the same individual essence with him: But his answer contains many things wholly inconsistent with that doctrine.

For his reply is, "That he could do nothing of himself," v. 19, 20. That "the Father judgeth no

man, but hath given all judgment to the Son," v. 22; and that "because he was the Son of Man," v. 27. "That he sought not his own will, but the will of the Father that sent him," v. 30. "That the Father which sent him," he was the person that "bore witness of him," v. 37. And that "he came not in his own, but in his Father's name," v. 34. And lastly, "the works which his Father had given him (power) to do, bore witness of him, that the Father had sent him," v. 36. All which sayings are plainly inconsistent with an identity of essence, will, and actions, in God the Father and the Son. In the 10th chap. they accuse him of blasphemy, not for saying, v. 30, "I and my Father are one," but as Christ himself declares, v. 36, because he said, "I am the Son of God." And yet he being accused of blasphemy, "because he being a man made himself God," had reason to reply, had it been true, that being of the same essence with the Father, by representing himself as God, he only told them the truth; whereas he proves himself to be only the Son of God, first, because the Father had "sanctified,[m] and sent him into the world;" and yet it is absurd to say, he either sanctified or sent into the world his own numerical essence. And secondly, because "he did the works of his Father," v. 37, to-wit, by virtue of that power which the Father had given him, John v. 36; and by the spirit of his Father dwelling in him: for "he did them by the Spirit of God," Matth. xii. 28; "by the finger of God," Luke xi. 20; "by the Father in him, as he was in the Apostles," John xiv. 20; and "who were in the Father and

[m] Dum ergo accipit sanctificationem a Patre, minor Patre est; minor autem Patre consequenter est, sed Filius: Pater enim si fuisset, sanctificationem dedisset, non accepisset. *Novatianus de Trinitate*, c. 22.

Son, as the Father was in the Son, and the Son in the Father," Joh. xvii. 22, 23.

Farther, it is remarkable that the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament seem plainly to speak of one who is called God and Lord in Scriptures, and yet is inferior to and derives his power from another.

For to omit Gen. xix. 24, which by the *Anti-Nicene Fathers* is generally interpreted of God the Father and the Son, this seems expressly to be contained in these words, Psalm xlv. 7, 8, "Thy seat, O God, endureth for ever, the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre: Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Now that these words are applied to Christ we learn from St. Paul, saying, "But to the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom," Heb i. 8. And secondly, This God hath another God who is stiled *his* God, and who hath anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows. For, saith the Baptist, John iii. 34. "God gave not the Spirit by measure unto him," as he did unto the other prophets. A like instance we have of two Lords in in these words,[n] Psalm cx. 1, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." For these words, *my Lord*, our blessed Saviour himself declares were spoken of Christ, Matt. xxii. 49. And the Apostle represents him a Lord who had all things put under him by a superior Lord, by saying, "The Lord

[n] Just. M. Dial. cum Trypth. p. 277, & p. 357, & Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. vii c. 12, p. 322, & l. xi. c. 14, p. 532, hæc habet, τὸν μεν ἀνωτάτω Θεὸν δια τȣ πρώτȣ κυρίȣ, τὸν δέ τȣτȣ δεύτερον δια τῆς δευτέρας ἀποφήνας προσηγορίας.

said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I have made thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts ii. 36. And the Apostle represents him as a Lord, who had all things put under him by a superior Lord, by saying, "When he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest he is excepted, which did put all things under him, that God may be all in all," 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28. From which words, Irenæus,[o] Tertullian, and Novatian prove that Christ, at the end of the world, is to give up his kingdom, or his dominion received from him, unto God the Father.

Another evidence of the superiority of God the Father to our Lord Jesus Christ ariseth from these words of St. Paul, "We know there is no other God but one; for though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven, or in earth, as there be Gods many, and Lords many, yet to us, *Christians*, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him;" 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6. Where it is plainly said, first, that all Christians know, that there is but one God. And,

Secondly, That that one God is God the Father. And,

Thirdly, That this God the Father is distinguished from our Lord Jesus Christ by this character, that he is God, ἐξ ὅ, *from whom are all things:* But our Lord is only He, δι ὅ, *by whom are all things:* And that God the Father is the Christians' one God, Christ their one Lord. It is scarcely possible to say this more fully, or more plainly than the Apostle doth. And seeing here the Apostle speaks of the Father in person, stiling him the Christians' one God; he must stile him

[o] Vide Interp. Patrum, in locum.

that one person, who hath emphatically, or by way of superiority, the Divine nature. But of this I have given a fuller proof in my reply to Dr. Waterland,[p] to which he hath yet returned no answer.

Thirdly, This also is evident, from those places which say, that such a thing was done by Jesus Christ, or such honour was conferred upon him "to the glory of God the Father. We are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ to the glory and praise of God," Phil. i. 11. And that "God had exalted him (who, being in the form of God, took upon him the form of a servant) and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is the Lord, to the glory of God the Father," chap. ii. 9, 10, 11.

And surely he who is Lord to the glory of God the Father, "who works in us the fruits of righteousness to the glory of God the Father," must be inferior to him whose glory is the end, both of his exaltation to be Lord, and of that righteousness he worketh in us. So when St. Peter saith, "If a man minister, let him do it, as of the ability which God giveth, that God in all things may be glorified, through Jesus Christ." For seeing actions flow from the essences of them whose actions they are; where the singular essence is one and the same, the action must be one and the same. And when an action is done by one to this end, that another may be glorified; he, to whose glory it is done, must be superior to him, for whose glory it is done: The end being still more noble than the means by which it is accomplished.

Fourthly, This still more visibly appears from that plain distinction, which is put betwixt God

[p] Sect. 4. from p. 95 to p. 100.

the Father, and the Son, by way of gradation, as in these words, "All are yours, for you are of Christ, *(or are Christ's)* and Christ is of God." Now we are Christ's, as being members of that body, of which he is the head; but yet with great inferiority to him. And therefore it seems reasonable to conceive, that these words, "Christ is of God," should signify that he is inferior and subordinate to him: especially, if we add to them the like words in this Epistle, chap. xi. 3, "The head of the woman is the man; the head of the man is Christ; the head of Christ is God." For the ground of these gradations is plainly the superiority and dominion, which the one hath over the other.

Fifthly, This is evident from those places in which they are put in opposition; as in these words, John xvii. 3, "This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent:" and 1 Thess. i. 9, 10, "Ye have turned from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come." From which words it is evident, that God the Father must be in some more excellent sense the only true God, the true and living God, than his Son Jesus Christ, whom he sent into the world.[q]

The same distinction and opposition appeareth from these words, "To the only wise God be glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. xvi. 27. And 1 Tim. vi. 13, 14, 15, 16, "I command

[q] Ecclesia Dei non prædicat duos Deos, ὅ γὰρ δυὸ ἀγένητα, ὅδὲ δυὸ ἄναρχα, ἀλλὰ μίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ Θεὸν εἶναι, τον ἀυτόν Πατέρα διδάσκουσα ειναι, ὅ μονογενοῦς ϗ ἀγαπητοῦ υἱοῦ μονον αληθινον Θεον μονον σοφον, ο μονος εχει αθανασιαν. *Quibus Epithetis Deum Patrem a Deo Filio distinguit.—Euseb. de Eccles Theol.* l. ii. c. 23, p. 141.

thee before God, who quickeneth all things, that thou keep this commandment unspotted, till the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in its proper season he shall shew, who is the only Potentate, who only hath immortality:" Where the God who quickeneth all things, is not only distinguished from our Lord Jesus Christ, but is stiled the only Potentate, who only hath immortality; that is, by a description, which in some eminent sense must agree to Him alone.

This, lastly, may be argued from those epithets, which are peculiar to God the Father, and are never in scripture applied to the Son. As,

First, that he is Θεὸς ὑψιστὸς, "God most high," or "the most high God," Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 20. So also he is called in the New Testament, Acts xvi. 17, Heb. vii. 1. Whereas the Son is only called υἱὸς τοῦ ὑψίστου, "the Son of the most High," Mark v. 7; Luke i. 32; vi. 35; viii. 28; Acts xvi. 17.

Secondly, the word (παντοκράτωρ) 2 Cor. vi. 18, which signifies, *omnipotens Deus qui omnibus imperat*, "the omnipotent God who commands over all," in scripture is the epithet of God the Father only. He is also stiled, "the only true God," John xvii. 3; "the only good God," Matth. xix. 17; "the only wise God," Rom. xvi. 27; "to God only wise, be glory, through Jesus Christ for ever," *Amen*. See also 1 Tim. i. 17, and Jude xxv. All which epithets shew that these excellencies do most eminently, originally, and properly, belong to God the Father; and only derivatively and consequentially to the Son, to whom they never are ascribed in the sacred writings.

In fine, this doctrine, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are of one and the same individual and numerical essence, seems to burlesque the Holy Scriptures, or to give them an uncouth and absurd

sense from the beginning of the Gospel to the end of the Epistles.

To select some few instances of this nature.

First, When St. Matthew saith, that at the baptism of our Saviour, the "Holy Ghost descended upon him in the shape of a dove; and a voice was heard from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased:" these words, according to this doctrine, must signify, that the supreme God descended upon the supreme God, and the voice of the supreme God said from heaven, This is the supreme God in whom I the same supreme God am well pleased.

Secondly, When it is often said, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me," Matth. x. 40; Luke x. 16; John xiii. 20; the meaning of these words must be this—He that receiveth you, receiveth the supreme God; and he that receiveth the supreme God, receiveth him that sent the supreme God: So that the supreme God must both send, and be sent by himself.

Thirdly, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me," John vii. 16. That is, according to this exposition, My doctrine is not the doctrine of the supreme God, but it is the doctrine of the supreme God that sent me. And,

Fourthly, When it is said, "Whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me," Mark ix. 37; and John xii. 44, "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me:" the meaning must be this—He that receiveth the supreme God, receiveth not the supreme God, but the supreme God that sent him. And he that believeth on me the supreme God, believeth not on me the supreme God, but on the supreme God that sent me.

Fifthly, John xi. 41, 42, Our Lord saith, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me; and I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." That is, I thank thee, O supreme God, that thou hast heard me the supreme God, and I knew that thou, the supreme God, hearest me the same supreme God always: But this I said, that they might know that thou, the supreme God, has sent me the same supreme God.

Sixthly, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the spirit of truth," John xiv. 16.[r] That is, I the supreme God, will pray the supreme God, and he shall send you the supreme God.

Seventhly, chap. xv. 26, "But when the Comforter is come," saith Christ, "whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." Where we have, first, I, the Father, and He; that is, three persons of the same numerical essence, one of which is sent by the same supreme God from the same supreme God, and is ο παρακλητος, one who is an advocate with the same supreme God.

Eighthly, Christ, in his prayer to the Father, saith, "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou, *the only true God*, has sent," John xvii. 3; which, according to this exposition, makes the only true God to send the same only true God with himself.

Ninthly, When St. Paul saith, "To the only wise God be glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Rom. xvi. 27; the meaning must be this—To the

[r] Υιος μεν ο παρακαλων, Πατηρ δε ο παρακαλουμενος, παρακλητος δε ο υποτελλομενος.—*Basil, contra Sabellianos. tom. i. p.* 521. *Vide Reliqua.*

only wise God be glory, through the same only wise God.

Tenthly, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25, &c. we have these words, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power; for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is Death; for he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest, that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Where we are plainly taught to put a clear and full distinction betwixt that God who is the Father, and him who is here stiled the Son. For,

First, He, (that is, that Son, who is here said to reign, and have a kingdom, and in the Prophet Daniel, to be stiled "one like the Son of Man, who comes to the antient of days, and hath dominion, and glory, and a kingdom given him that all people, nations, and languages should serve him;") He is here said to *deliver up his kingdom*, at the close of the world, *to the Father*.

Secondly, God the Father, or Jehovah, is He that is said to put all things under his feet, with plain ralation to these words, Psalm cx. 1, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thy foes thy footstool." Whence the Apostle here saith, that he must reign till He, that is, God, hath put all enemies under his feet.

Thirdly, The Apostle adds, that when it is said, that he hath put all things under him, it is manifest that he, that is, God, is excepted, which did put all things under him.

Fourthly, He farther saith, that when all things are put under him by God, then shall the Son himself *be subject to him that did put all things under him.* And,

Lastly, he adds, that this is to be done, *that God,* (even the Father to whom he is to deliver up this kingdom) *may be all in all.*

Now it is the highest absurdity to say that both these persons, this Father and this Son, have both one and the same numerical essence; this being in effect to say,

First, That this Son must deliver up this kingdom from and to himself.

Secondly, That he must sit at his own right hand, and that this Lord must say unto himself, Sit thou on my right hand.

Thirdly, That the one supreme God must be excepted from the one supreme God.

Fourthly, That he must be subject to himself. And,

Fifthly, That all this must be done, that God the Father may be all in all. All which seem palpable absurdities and contradictions.

Sixthly, Eph. ii. 18, "Through him we both have an access by one spirit unto the Father;" that is, by the supreme God, through the supreme God, we have an access to the same supreme God.

Seventhly, Eph iv. 4, "There is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all;" that is, there is one supreme God, one supreme God, and one supreme God.

Eighthly, The Apóstle tells the Philippians, c. i. 11, "That they are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God;" that is, of himself: and chap. ii. "That Christ being in the form of God," that is, being the supreme God, "thought it no robbery

to be equal with" the same supreme "God," that is, with himself; and "that" the supreme "God had exalted him, and given him a name above every name," and requires all persons to confess, "that Jesus was the Lord," that is, the supreme God, "to the glory of God the Father," that is, of the same supreme God, Phil. ii. 6, 9.

Ninthly, Coloss. iii. 4, "Christ sitteth at the right hand of God;" that is, the supreme God sitteth at his own right hand.

Tenthly, Thess i. 9, 10, "Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come;" that is, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for the same supreme God, raised up from the dead.

Eleventhly, Heb. ii. 3, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which, at the first, began to be spoken by the Lord—God also beareth witness to it;" that is, the one supreme God bearing witness to the word spoken by the same supreme God.

Twelfthly, 1 Pet. i. 21, "By Christ we believe in God;" that is, by the supreme God we believe in the same supreme God, "that our faith and hope might be in" the same "God."

Thirteenthly, 1 John ii. 2, "If we sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins;" that is, with the same supreme God; and he, the same supreme God, is the propitiation for our sins.

Fourteenthly, Jude iv. "Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ;" that is, denying the only Lord God, and the same only Lord God.

Fifteenthly, Rev. i. 1, "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him;" that is, the

revelation of the one supreme God, which the one supreme God gave unto him. See also v. 5, and chap iii. v. 12 "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and I will write upon him the name of my God;" that is, him that overcometh, I the one supreme God will make a pillar in the house of me the same God, and will write upon him the name of me the same God, and the name of the city of me the same God. And v. 21, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I overcame, and am sit down with my Father in his throne." Now surely the same supreme God must have the same throne with him who is the same supreme God: unless it can be said, that the same essence has one throne, and the person of the same essence has another.

This will be still more evident, from a reflection upon the third person on this point, who, according to this doctrine, is of the same individual essence with God the Father, and the Son. For as hence it necessarily follows, that the spirit of God is the same with the God of God, and to receive this spirit, is to receive that God who gives the spirit; so it is manifestly inconsistent with many passages of the holy scripture which speak of him: for instance, first, our Saviour saith, John xvi. 13, "When the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine and shew it unto you." Now it is self-evident, that the supreme God must speak of and from himself, and not what he heareth from another; and that he can take nothing from another to shew to us. So Rom. viii. 26, "The spirit helpeth our infirmi-

ties" in prayer to God, "and maketh intercession to him for us;" that is, he maketh intercession to himself. And again, "The spirit maketh intercession for us according to the will of God, v. 27; that is, according to his own will: and 1 Cor. ii. 10, "But God hath revealed the things that he hath prepared for them that love him, to us by his spirit;" that is, by himself, "for the spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God;" that is, of himself; and v. 11, "The things of God knoweth ουδεις none, but the spirit of God;" that is, God himself; and v. 12, "Now we have received the spirit of God," that is, the supreme God, "that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God;" that is, of the same God; and 1 Cor. iii. 16, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God; and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?" that is, the same God dwelleth in you; and chap. vi. 19, "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost," that is, of God which is in you, "and which is given you of" the same "God?" and Eph. ii. 22, "You are builded together for an habitation of God through the spirit," that is, through the same God. With many other sayings of the like import.

DR. WHITBY's LAST THOUGHTS.

PART II.

I Proceed now to expound some passages of scripture, which seem to have been misunderstood by most modern expositors, and sometimes also by *myself*. As,

First, Those words of Christ, Luke x. 22, "No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him;" and John i. 18, "No man hath seen God at any time, *the only*-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father," that is, who is intimately acquainted with his *mind* and *will*, he hath declared him.

That these words cannot concern the *metaphysical* nature of the Father and the Son, is evident, because our Saviour hath made no such declaration or revelation of that nature to us or his disciples. They therefore only can concern the dispensation of the New Testament, and salvation by Jesus Christ, and the knowledge of the *will* of the Father, and the way by which he would be worshipped, delivered to us by his Son.

Hence, when St. Peter had declared, that "Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God," (or as it is, Mark viii. 29, "Thou art the Christ,") Christ said unto him, "Flesh and blood have not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven, Matth. xvi. 17; and John xvii. 6, Christ also saith, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me, and they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee, and have known, surely, that thou hast sent me."

From which two places it appears, that God the Father, by revealing to St. Peter that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, revealed the Son to him; and that Christ himself, by manifesting unto his disciples that he came from God, and that he had sent him, manifested his Father's name to them; and John xvi. 25, He promised hereafter to shew them plainly of the Father; and yet he did this, not by giving them any instructions concerning the *metaphysical* nature of the Father, or any declarations of that nature, but only by giving them a clear insight into the tenor of the gospel-dispensation, and into the counsel of his will.

Secondly, To proceed to those words, John x. 30, "I and my Father are one."

The great question here is, whether these words are to be understood of the unity of the Father and Son, as to their same *monadical essence*, or, (as many of the Anti-Nicene Fathers did interpret them) of an unity in will, design, affection, and concord?

That they could not be intended to declare an unity of their individual essence, seems highly probable, both from the context, from the like expressions in the scripture, and from the very nature of the thing.

First, From the context: For there our Saviour saith, "The works that I do in my Father's name," that is, by his authority and power imparted to me, "bear witness of me," v. 25; which words are evidently repugnant to a numerical unity of essence in them both. Since, where the essence is one, the actions must be one, and done by the same authority and power.

To which add, that the words, *I and my Father*, are words plainly importing two persons; for the word *Father* is personal, and the word *I* is a pronoun personal; so that if these two are one and the same God by virtue of this text, they must be one in person as well as essence.

Moreover, v. 29, "My Father which gave them me, *(saith Christ)* is greater than all;" which again destroys the numerical unity of essence betwixt both; since no one essence can give any thing to itself, and much less a divine and all-perfect essence: Nor can one essence be greater than itself; whereas our Lord expressly saith, "My Father is greater than I," John xiv. 28.

Secondly, This will be farther evident from the parallel expressions used by our Lord, in the same gospel, where he prays that his disciples "may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they might be made perfect in one." And yet, doubtless, he could not pray that his disciples might be one in essence with the Father and Son, but only that they might be one, by having the spirit of the Father and Son dwelling in them; in which sense[s] Athenagoras says, the Father and Son are one, viz. ενοτητι τȣ πνευματος, by unity of the spirit.

Thus Origen[t] interprets this verse. For having cited these words, "I and my Father are one;" if any one, saith he, is disturbed at these expressions,

[s] P. 10. [t] *Contra Celsum*, p. 386.

as if we favoured the opinion of the Noetians, who deny the Father and the Son to be δυο υποςασεις, two singular existences; let him consider this text, Acts iv. 34, "All that believeth were of one heart and one soul," and then he will understand this, "I and my Father are one thing." We serve therefore, ως αποδεδωκαμεν, as we formerly explained it, one God the Father, and the Son; we worship the Father of the truth, and also the Son who is the truth, being indeed two things in substance, but in agreement and consent, and sameness of will, they are one.

Here, indeed, he only saith we worship the Father of the truth, and the Son who is the truth and wisdom; but in his comment on John, p. 70, he adds, that the Father is πλειων, μειζων αληθεια, a fuller and greater truth, and, being the Father of wisdom, is greater and more excellent, as he is wisdom, than the Son. Then he proceeds, p. 387, to shew, that among the multitude of believers, some differing from the rest rashly affirmed, as the Noetians did, that our Saviour was the God over all; which, saith he, we Christians, or we of the church, do not believe, as giving credit to the same Saviour, who said, "My Father is greater than I." And lastly, he saith, p. 38, We Christians manifestly teach, that the Son is not stronger than the Father, who is the creator of the world, αλλ' υποδεέςερῳ, but inferior in power to him. Which words afford the clearest demonstration, that the church of that age did not believe that our Saviour was ο επι πασι Θεος, the supreme God, or one of the same numerical essence with the Father; and therefore could not interpret those words of such an unity, but only of an unity of concord, mind, and will. Hence, in his comment upon St. John, p. 227, he saith, that this unity of will is the cause why Christ said,

"I and my Father are one;" and in his next page adds, that the will which is in Christ is the image of the first will, and the divinity which is in Christ is the image of the true divinity.

Novatian is, if possible, still more express in this interpretation; for in answer to the objection of the Sabellians from this place, he saith, that *unum*, being here put in the neuter gender, denotes not an unity of person, but a concord of society between them; they being deservedly stiled *one*, by reason of their concord and love, and because whatsoever the Son is, he is from the Father. The Apostle, saith he, knew this unity of concord with the distinction of persons, by writing to the Corrinthians thus—*I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase*: for who understands not that Paul is one person, and Apollos another? And that they had diverse offices, one to plant, and another to water? And yet the Apostle Paul saith of these two εν εισι, they are one; though as to the distinction of persons they are two, with other things of like nature.

And here it is to be observed, that Pamelius's note upon these words, is this: *Nempe in hoc loco, non satis accuratè scribere Novatianum, quod nullam essentiæ Patris & Filii communicationem; adferat, sed exemplum ab Apostolo unitati essentiæ veluti contrarium; in quo certe hallucinatum fuisse auctorem non vereor dicere, quum postea ecclesia in diversis conciliis diversum definiverit.* That is, Novatian did not write accurately in this place, as making no mention of the communion of the essence betwixt the Father and the Son, but introducing an example from the Apostle, as it were contrary to it; in which thing I doubt not to pronounce him erroneous, seeing the church afterwards in diverse councils defined the contrary.

And yet it is certain, that many of the Anti-Nicene Fathers in effect said the same thing; for Justin[u] pronounces the Son to be ετερ Θ απο τε Πατερος αριθμω ου γνωμη, another from the Father in number, but not in consent; and his reason follows thus, because he never would do any thing but what ο τον κοσμον ποιησας, υπερ ον αλλΘ ουκ εστι Θεος, βεβουληται και πραξαι, και ομιλησαι, the Maker of the world would have him do and speak. Where, first, This God the Father is plainly stiled another in number from him that made the world. And, secondly, the Son is represented as one not doing his own will, but being in all things subservient to and delivering the words of that God, from whom he is thus distinguished.

Lactantius[w] saith, that the Father and Son are one, *quia unanimes incolunt mundum*, because they unanimously dwell in the world.

Eusebius[x] pronounces the Father and Son to be one, ου καθ' υποστασιν, αλλα κατ την κοινωνιαν της δεξης, not as to the essence, but as to communion of glory. And, lastly,

The council of Antioch pronounceth the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be τρια μεν υποστασει τη δε συμφωνια εν, that is, three in subsistence, but one only in consent or concord. Tertullian[y] declares, in answer to this objection of the Sabellians, that these words, "I and the Father," *duorum esse significationem*, signify two; and then adds, that, *Unum neutrali verbo non pertinet ad singularitatem, sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad conjunctionem, ad delectionem Patris qui Filium diligit; & ad obsequium Filii qui voluntati Patris obsequitur.* Which last words shew, that it is impossible that this text should be interpreted of the numerical essence, or unity of the Father and Son; seeing one

[u] Dial. cum Tryph. p. 276. [w] Lib. iv. c. 29.
[x] Eccles. l. iii. c. 19. [y] *Adversus Praxeam.* c. xxii. p. 575.

and the same essence cannot be obsequious or obedient to itself. And yet there is nothing more common among the Anti-Nicene Fathers, than to say with Novatian, who having affirmed that the Son *obedierit Patri & obediat*, always did and always doth obey the Father, thence makes this inference, *Quid tam evidens esse potest hunc non Patrem esse, sed Filium, quam quod obediens Patri Deo proponitur?* What more evidently shews that Christ is not the Father, but the Son, than this, that Christ is obedient to the Father? cap. 23; and again cap. 30, *Filius nihil ex arbitrio suo gerit, nec ex consilio suo fecit, nec a se venit; sed imperiis Paternis omnibus & preceptis obedit, ut quamvis probet illum nativitas Filium, tamen morigera obedientia asserat ipsum Paternæ voluntatis, ex quo est ministrum. Ita dum se Patri in omnibus obtemperantem reddit, quamvis sit & Deus, unum tamen Deum Patrem de obedientia sua ostendit, ex quo & traxit originem.* That is, in short, The Son of God, by his dutiful obedience to all his Father's commands and to his will, (he doing nothing by his own will and counsel) by this demonstrated, that though he was God, yet the Father from whom he came forth, and whom he obeyed, was the one God, even that one God, of whom he saith, *Nos scimus, & legimus, & credimus, & tenemus, unum esse Deum, qui fecit cœlum pariter ac terram, quoniam nec alterum novimus, aut noscere (cum multus sit) aliquando poterimus.* That is, We Christians know, believe, and hold, that there is one only God, the creator of heaven and earth; nor know we, nor can we know, any other, because there is no other. And again, God the Father is, *Unus Deus, cujus neque magnitudem, neque majestati, neque virtuti quicquam non dixerim præferri, sed nec comparari potest;* that is, that one

God, to whose greatness, majesty, and power, nothing can be compared, Cap. 30; and indeed all the Greek Fathers, from Justin to Eusebius inclusive, do frequently inform us that the Son did υπηρετειν τω θελημαται του Πατρος, obey the will of the Father, that he did υπαρχειν, διακονειν, υπηρετειν, minister and was subservient to him.

And all that writ in Latin, from Tertullian to Lactantius inclusively, that he did, *Patris voluntati administrare*, administer to the will of the Father; That he did, *obedire in omnibus Patri*, obey the Father in all things; That the Son, *voluntati Patris fiedliter paret nec unquam faciat aut fecerit, nisi quod Pater aut voluit aut jussit*, faithfully obeyed the will of his Father, and never doth, our would do any thing, but what the Father willed, or ordered him to do, l. iv. c. 29.

It being therefore certain, that one and the same essence can have but one and the same will, and that one singular and numerical essence cannot administer to the will, obey and be subservient to the will and commands of another; hence it is demonstratively evident, that he who does so, cannot have the same numerical essence and will with the Father.

Thirdly, John xiv. 9, 10, "Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet has thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of my self, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works." Where,

First, as to those words, "I dwell in the Father, and the Father in me," they are so far from proving that he is of the same individual essence with the

Father, that the same Apostle in his general epistle ascribes the same to all good Christians, saying, 1 John iii. "He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in God, and God in him;" and chap. iv. 12, 13, 14, "No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his spirit. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God; and we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." And St. Paul saith, that "Christ dwelleth in the Christian's heart by faith," Eph. iii. 17. Yea in this very gospel of St. John, it is said of all true believers, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him:" and of his disciples, "that the spirit of God dwelleth with them, and shall be in them;" and of all true believers, "that the spirit of God dwelleth in them," Rom. viii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 14, and by so doing, renders them the temple of God. And yet it is certain, that by this inhabitation, they are not rendered one in essence with God the Father.

And even our Communion-service saith, that if we are worthy communicants, we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; and we pray that we may ever dwell in him, and he in us; and this is said agreeably to those words of Christ, John xiv. 23, "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him;" and yet surely it cannot be affirmed from these texts, that God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are so united to all true believers, as to render them of one and the same individual essence with them.

Moreover Christ here saith, "the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works." Whereas where the essence is one and the same, the action done by that essence, must be one and the same; and so could not be truly said to be done by another.

As for these words, John xiv. 10, "I am in the Father and the Father in me;" and these, chap. x. 38, "That ye may believe that the Father is in me, and I in him;" that they cannot refer to the unity of essence of the Father and Son, is evident, from Christ's saying and promising the same thing to his disciples: It being certain, he could neither promise, nor pray the Father that they should be one in essence with him; and yet he promiseth this in these words, John xiv. 20, "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you;" he prays for this in these words, John xvii. 21, "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me;" and so these words are interpreted by Origen and Eusebius.

Nor, fourthly, can this be inferred from those words of Christ to Thomas and Philip, chap. xiv. 9, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father?" For there our Saviour plainly shews, that they might have known and seen him, by reason of his presence with them, and his discourses to them; and that by these things he had shewed them the Father. And yet it is certain, that neither by his long abodes with them, nor his discourses to them, had he shewn them the essence of the Father; but only had acquainted them with the

will and dispensations of the Father. Of these things He by his long continuance with them fully had acquainted them; but had not said one word of his identity in essence with the Father.

So Christ saith to the Pharisees, "Ye neither know me, nor my Father; for if ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also," John viii. 19; and to his disciples in this very chap. ver. 7, "From henceforth ye know him, and have seen him;" and yet it is certain they neither knew nor could see the essence of him who is invisible. Yea, Christ saith of the unbelieving Jews, "Now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father," John xv. 24; that is, They from those miracles I have wrought amongst them, have had sufficient means to see and know, both that I came from God, and am a revealer of his will, though they, through their prejudice and perverseness, neither truly knew (that is, acknowledged) me nor my Father. Nor,

Fifthly, can this be inferred from these words, John xv. 16, "All things that the Father hath are mine;" for surely he might say this, whatsoever was his nature, "who knew that the Father had given all things into his hand," John xiii. 3; and that he did this as the effect of his love to him, for, saith the Baptist, "the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand," John iii. 35. And then this is so far from being a proof of the identity of the essence of the Father and Son, that it is a demonstration to the contrary; seeing one individual essence can give nothing to, nor receive any thing from itself, because it can give nothing but what it hath already, and therefore cannot receive by way of gift.

And this in an all-perfect and self-existent being is the more certain, because it is incapable of any accession to its absolute perfection. If, then, God

the Son hath the same numerical essence, which God the Father hath, it could not properly and truly be said, "That the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand:" Or that "Jesus knew that the Father had given all things into his hand," John xiii. 3.

Secondly, Our Saviour adds, "that the spirit shall take of mine, and shew it unto you;" and yet the spirit did not shew to them any thing concerning the *metaphysical* essence of the Father, and the Son; nor doth he say, all the excellencies and perfections of the Father are mine; but only, παντα, all things relating to the gospel-dispensation, they being all taught him by the Father. And hence he saith to the Jews, marvelling how he should be able to teach what they thought he never learnt, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me;" that is, as the following words shew, "It is not spoken by me from myself, but from God." Nor,

Sixthly, Will this follow from the mighty works Christ did; because he himself promises to his disciples, John xiv. 12, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father, who is greater than I, and so can enable you to do greater works." Hence, saith he to them, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I said, I go to my Father, for my Father is greater than I," John xiv. 28. Nor,

Seventhly, Will this follow from Christ's command to baptize all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is to be baptized into the profession of our belief in *one God the Father Almighty;* in *one Lord Jesus Christ,* the only-begotten Son of God, sent by his Father to reveal his will; and in the *Holy Spirit of*

God, by whose assistance the holy scriptures were indited; so that this profession is absolutely necessary to our being worshippers of the true God, who made heaven and earth; to our being Christians, or owners of the Son of God, as the true Messiah, and of the holy scripture as indited by the spirit of God; and therefore it was absolutely necessary, that the heathens, who owned none of these things whilst they continued infidels, should be baptized into this profession, in order to their embracing the Christian faith. Nor,

Eighthly, Can this be inferred from these words of St. Thomas, "My Lord, and my God;" as will appear from this consideration, that the faith of St. Thomas was only this, that Jesus was really risen from the dead; for when the Apostles had told him they had seen the Lord, he answers, "That except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe" (it.) Then Christ coming a second time, saith unto him, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing, (viz.) that I am risen."

Lastly, Our Saviour saith, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed;" which shews that he could believe only what he had seen, to-wit, that the same body was raised, which had been crucified; neither had he seen, nor could he see with his bodily eyes, that He who was thus raised, was his Lord and his God. These words therefore, "My Lord and my God," may have this import—My Lord and my God have done this: And so they exactly agree with the faith of the Apostles, saying, "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree," Acts v. 20. See Acts ii. 24; Acts iii. 15;

iv. 10; and xiii. 30: Or thus, My Lord, and my God, how great is thy power! For, saith St. Paul, "God exerted the greatness of his power, and the activity of his might, in raising our Lord Jesus from the dead," Eph. i. 19, 20. But whether this be the true import of St. Thomas's words or no, certain it is, that it cannot be proved, that he did intend by them to signify that he owned Jesus Christ as his Lord and his God;

First, Because he was bred up in the Jewish faith, which taught him that the Lord his God, the God of Israel, was one Lord, and that there was no other than he. And, secondly, It would have contradicted the faith of Christ himself, who after his resurrection speaks to his disciples thus: "I ascend to my Father and to your Father, and to my God and your God," John xx. 17.

And again, "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: And I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God; and I will write uponhim my new name," Rev. iii. 12.

Now hence we learn how weak are the chief arguments of Athanasius, St. Ambrose, and Cyril of Alexandria, and other ancients, to confirm this unity of essence betwixt the Father and the Son, they being taken from these words of John, which, as I have shewed, afford no firm proof or evidence of this matter.

Lastly, Nor will this follow from these words of St. John, "The word was God." For if that implies, that he is the same numerical God with God the Father, it plainly is repugnant to all the passages following, cited in the foregoing arguments, from this Evangelist, and also to the text itself, where,

of this word which he stiles God, he twice says, "That he was with God." But to say that he was the same God, with whom he was, is a contradiction in terms: though, indeed, it was the ancient heresy of Sabellius.

Moreover of this word, which is here stiled God, the Apostle saith, "He came to his own, and his own received him not." Which cannot be true of God the Father, whom the Jews always owned to be their God; but only of that Jesus, who is here said to be with God, and to be God.

Thus have I considered all the arguments for this identity of the Father and Son, produced from the Evangelist.

I come next to consider those which are offered to the same purpose from the Epistles, of which the first is taken from Rom. ix. 5, where in our translation we read thus: "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, ο ων επι παντων Θεος ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας.

Now to this argument, I have returned one answer in my reply to Dr. Waterland, by approving the ingenious conjecture of a learned critic, that these words are to be read thus, ων ο επι παντων Θεος, and are to be referred to God the Father's being the God of the Jews; and then the whole verse will run thus, ων οι Πατερες, και εξ ων ο Χριστος, "whose are the Father's, and of whom is Christ according to the flesh; ων, of whom, or whose, is the God over all, blessed for ever;" he being peculiarly known to them, and related to them as their God in covenant; and this exposition is the more probable, because this phrase is by the same Apostle, in this epistle, and in another, plainly referred to God the Father; as when he says, Rom. i. 25, "The Heathens worshipped the creature more than the Creator, ος εστιν

ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας: and 2 Cor. xi. 31, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, ος εστιν ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.

But, secondly, The words read according to our translation, are interpreted by Hippolytus thus: That Christ is God over all, because God the Father had delivered all things into his hand; and, as the Apostle saith, "had made him head over all things to the Church," Eph. i. 22. His words are these: In these words of the Apostle he plainly sets forth the mystery of truth. "He that is over all is God," for so he dares to say, "all things are delivered to me of my Father."[z] And again, he rightly calls him "omnipotent;" for this Christ testifies, by saying, "all things are delivered to me of my Father;" and he hath a dominion over all things, and so is made omnipotent by the Father. And it is worthy of observation, that this interpretation of these words is given by Hippolytus, in answer to Noëtus, who used them in confirmation of his Sabellian doctrine.

And whereas it is said by some, that the Apostle having said in the immediate preceding words, "That Christ came from the Father, κατα σαρκα, according to the flesh," or as to his human nature, it is reasonable to conceive he should proceed to say, what he was according to his divine nature. That this is not necessary, appears from Clemens Rom.[a] where speaking of the dignity of Abraham,

[z] Καλως διηγειται ϗ λαμπρον το της αληθειας μυστηριον, ουτος ων επι παντων Θεος εστιν. λεγει γαρ ουτω μετα παρρησιας παντα μοι παραδεδοται υπο του Πατρος. Et rursus καλως ειπεν παντοκρατορα Κριστον τουτο γαρ ειπεν και αυτω μαρτυρησει ο Κριστος. μαρτυρων γαρ Κριστος. εφη, παντα μοι παραδεδοται υπο του Πατρος και παντων κρατει. παντοκρατωρ παρα Πατρος κατεσταθη Κριστος. *Contra Noet.* p. 10.

[a] Epist. *ad Corinthios.* Sect. 32.

he saith, "That from him descended the Lord Jesus, κατα σαρκα, according to the flesh;" but saith not one word concerning his spiritual descent. Nor,

Secondly, Doth this follow from these words of the Apostle, Gal. iv. 8, "When ye knew not God, ye worshipped them, who by nature were no Gods;" Christ being by nature truly God, as having by that nature which he derives from the Father true divine power and dominion over all things, both in heaven and earth, in subordination to him who alone is absolutely ο Παντοκρατωρ, of himself supreme over all.

Secondly, These words may be fairly rendered thus, "ye worshipped Gods, τοις μη φυσει, Gods which had no being or existence in nature;" for such were many of their fictitious Gods, Venus, Diana, Minerva, &c. or Gods made with hands, for of such Gods the Apostle saith, "we know that an idol is nothing." And Demetrius, the silversmith, complains that St. Paul taught "that they were no Gods that were made with hands," Acts xix. 26; and the Psalmist saith, "The Gods of the Heathens are the works of men's hands," Psalm cxv. 5, and in this sense this text cannot at all concern our blessed Lord. Nor,

Thirdly, Will this follow from those passages, which say, "All things were made by him, and by him were all things created;" it being expressly said in the same scriptures, "That God created all things *by* Jesus Christ," Eph. iii. 9; "and that *by* him, he (that is, God the Father) made the worlds,"[b] Heb. i. 2. Now he *by* whom God the Father made all things, cannot be the same God with him who made all things *by* him. Nor,

[b] Παντα δια τε λογε εγενετο, ε υπο τε λογε αλλ' : πο κρειτΐονος, κ̀ μειζονος παρα τον λογον. τις δε αν αλλος ετος τυγχανη ἢ ὁ Πατηρ. Orig. Com. in Johan. p. 56.—Et υπηρετης τε δημιεργ ειγνομενος ὁ λογος τον κοσμον κατεσκευασε, p. 61.

Fourthly, Doth this follow from these words of the Apostle, "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," Coloss. ii. 9; for, first, this fullness refers not to the divine nature, but to the fullness of his "divine wisdom and knowledge," v. 3, by which he is completely enabled to manifest to us both the will and perfections of God.

And whereas against this it is objected, that το Θειον and Θεοτης do never signify the doctrine of the gospel; and that the will of God cannot be said to dwell bodily in any person: To this I answer, first, that though the words το Θειον και Θεοτης absolutely put, do never signify the doctrine of the gospel; yet πληρωμα της Θεοτητος may signify the complete ability of that divine person who is God; and in this sense the Church is said to be or have the fullness of that God who is all in all, by having his whole will revealed to them; and again, "if all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, may be said to be hid in Christ," Coloss. ii. 3, why may they not also be said to dwell in him?

Thus St. John the Baptist saith of Christ, chap. i. 16, 17, "That he was full of grace and truth, and of his fullness have we all received;" not meaning that we had received of the fullness of his Godhead, but only a full knowledge of the grace and truth, which he was sent to reveal to the world. And St. Paul prays, that the Ephesians "might comprehend with all Saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and heighth; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God," Eph. iii. 18, 19; where certainly he doth not pray that all Saints may be filled with the divine nature of God, but only that they might have a sufficient knowledge of the love of God, in sending his beloved Son to acquaint them with the riches of his love to them in Christ

Jesus, this fullness being to be obtained "by Christ dwelling in their hearts by faith," v. 17.

Secondly, Whatever this fulness of the Godhead means, it was conferred on him by the good pleasure of the Father; for, saith the same Apostle, chap. i. 19, "it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell;" that is, it pleased the Father thus to invest him with the fullness of divine power and wisdom for the creation of all things, and for the redemption, and government, and preservation of his whole church; for had he been one and the same all-perfect God with the Father, it could not have been truly said, "That it pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness dwell;" for then he must have had it from the perfection of his own nature, and not from the pleasure of his Father. And,

Lastly, This will farther appear from the connection of these words with the foregoing, where the Apostle cautions the Colossians against the philosophy and vain deceit of the heathen moralists, taught after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ; for, saith he, "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily;" which seems to be a plain dehortation from attending to the knowledge taught by these heathen philosophers, because of the fullness of the knowledge which was in Christ, and adds, "That we are complete in him, not surely by having the same Godhead with him, but by receiving a full and sufficient knowledge of the whole will of God revealed to us." Nor

Fifthly, Will this follow from these words of the Apostle, "Looking for that blessed hope, and glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ," Tit. ii. 13; for that the great God there signifies God the Father, is fully proved by Dr. Clarke, in his comment upon that text.

Lastly, That the true God mentioned, 1 John v. 20, is not the Son of God, but the Father, who by our Saviour is stiled the only true God, is proved from the ancient reading of these words, thus, "The Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding, ινα γινωσκωμεν τον αληθινον Θεον, that we may know the true God, και εσμεν εν τω αληθινω υιω αυτου Ιησου Κριστω, and we are in his true Son Jesus Christ." This God, of whom the Son of God hath given us this knowledge (as our Lord hath told us, John xvii. 3) "is the true God, and the knowledge of him is eternal life." Thus the disciple accords well with his master, and only teacheth what he had learnt from him. [As for Rev. i. 8, see Dr. Clarke's scripture doctrine, p. 62, 63, 64; and the modest plea continued p. 12.]

A TABLE

Of the Phrases, our Lord Jesus Christ, *or* Christ Jesus our Lord, *which occur in the Epistles.*

No.

1. Rom. i. 7.—Grace be with you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.
2. —— iv. 24.—Faith shall be imputed to us, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.
3. —— v. 1.—We have peace with God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.
4. —— ib. 11.—We joy in God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.

No.

5. Rom. vi. 11.—Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be alive unto God *through* Jesus Christ our Lord.

6. —— ib. 23.—The gift of God is eternal life *through* Jesus Christ our Lord.

7. —— vii. 25.—I thank God *through* Jesus Christ our Lord.

8. —— viii. 39.—Nothing shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

9. —— x. 9.—If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

10. —— xvi. 27.—To the only wise God be glory *through* Jesus Christ our Lord.

11. 1 Cor. i. 4.—I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given to you by Jesus Christ our Lord.

12. —— ib. 9.—God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

13. —— xv. 57.—Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.

14. 2 Cor. xiii. 14.—The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.

15. Eph. iii. 11.—According to the eternal purpose which he proposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

16. —— iv. 5, 6.—One Lord, one God and Father, who is above all, &c.

17. —— v. 20.—Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

No.

18. Eph. vi. 23.—Peace be to the brethren, and love, and faith, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

19. Phil. ii. 11.—Every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

20. —— iii. 17.—Whatever ye do in word or deed, do all in the *name* of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father *by* him.

21. 1 Thess. i. 3.—Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father.

22. —— iii. 11.—Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you.

23. —— ib. 13.—That he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

22. 2 Thess. i. 1.—To the Church of the Thessalonians in God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ

23. —— ib. 12.—According to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

24. —— ii. 16.—Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father which hath loved us—comfort your hearts.

25. 1 Tim. v. 21.—I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, that thou observe these things.

26. —— vi. 13.—I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, that thou keep this commandment without spot unrebuke-

No.

able, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.

27. 2 Tim. iv. 1.—I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead.

28. Titus iii. 6.—God shed on us the Holy Ghost abundantly, *through* Jesus Christ our Saviour—Acts ii. 23.

29. 2 Pet. i. 16.—Our Lord Jesus Christ received from God the Father honour and glory.

30. Jude 21.—Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Should any man instead of these words, "Our Lord Jesus Christ," put these, "The same God," or "The same supreme God," as (if our Lord Jesus Christ was the same God with the Father) he might do, the sense would be so harsh and disagreeable as would constrain him to suspect the truth of that assertion.

Moreover it farther is considerable, that in all the places of the Old Testament, where Christ is undoubtedly spoken of, he is still represented as a King to whom the Father had *given* a kingdom, or as a Lord who had received, or was to receive, dominion from him; so *v. g.* Psalm ii. 2, we read thus—"The Kings of the earth and the Princes are gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ;" which Acts iv. 25, 27, is thus interpreted, "Against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed." In the following verses God is introduced speaking thus—"I have *set* my King upon my holy hill of Sion," v. 6; and again, v. 7, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," which by St. Paul is interpreted of Christ's resurrection, when "all power in heaven and earth was committed to him," his words being these, "The

promise which was made unto the fathers he hath now fulfilled, in that he hath raised up Jesus again," as it is written in the second Psalm, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;" and because Christ was not to be an high-priest on earth, but only in the heavens, where he was to appear in the presence of God for us, Heb. ix. 24; therefore the Apostle interprets this also of his priestly office, saying, "Christ glorified not himself to be made an high-priest," but he that said unto him, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," Heb. v. 5. In the words following, Psalm ii. 8, God saith to him, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession;" clearly declaring that Christ's kingdom was a kingdom to be given him of that Father of whom he was to ask it,

Secondly, In the 45th Psalm, the Psalmist begins thus—"I speak of the things which I have made touching the King;" and of this King he saith, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre; thou lovest righteousness and hatest iniquity; wherefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows;" where most of the Anti-Nicene Fathers note, that there is mention of one God, who was the God of another stiled also God, who had anointed him to his kingly office, and set him up above all his fellows.

Thirdly, This is still more evident from Psalm cx. for there is mention made of one Lord saying to another Lord, that is, to our Lord Christ, (as he himself interprets these words, Matt. xxii. 44) "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool;" and this Lord is represented as a king reigning in the midst among his enemies, v. 2.

Fourthly, Isaiah xlix. 6, God speaketh to one who is called his servant, thus—"It is a light thing that thou ſhouldest be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth." That these words relate to the person of our blessed Saviour is evident, both from the New Testament, where he is said to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles," Luke i. 7, 9; and ii. 23; and also from the greatness of the promise, that he should be his "salvation to the ends of the earth;" and here the words "my servant," and "my salvation," demonstrate that the person here mentioned cannot be the same individual essence with that God whose servant he is, and whose salvation he declares to all the world

Fifthly, Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, we read thus—"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth In his days Judah shall dwell safely, and this is his name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our righteousness.*" Where,

First, we have mention of a King that shall reign and prosper. And,

Secondly, This King, is to be raised up by God; for I will raise up a King, saith the Lord. And

Thirdly, The name given to the King is *The Lord our righteousness*, as procuring unto us that righteousness, or remission of sins, which the law could not give, Gal. ii. 21, and iii. 21, "For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousneess of God in him," 2 Cor. v. 21; that is, that we may be accepted as righteous, through that atonement which he hath made to God for us by his sin-offering.

Fourthly, The prophet Daniel having given the description of the four monarchies, chap. ii. adds, v. 44, these words, "That in the days of these Kings the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed:" and this he did, chap. 7, "by giving to the Son of Man," that is, the Lord Jesus, "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." And this dominion is called an "everlasting dominion which shall not pass away."

Fifthly, The prophet Malachi speaks thus—"The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple," chap iii. 1; where it is agreed on by all Christian interpreters, that this Lord is Christ, even that Jesus whom "God hath made both Lord and Christ," Acts. ii. 36, that one Lord of Christians, Jesus Christ, "by whom are all things." Here then it is manifest, that even those Jews who owned only one Lord of heaven and earth, and one God, and none other but he, Mark xii. 35, expected, notwithstanding, another Lord, who should suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whose coming they with great joy expected.

In fine, that celebrated place, Isaiah ix. 6, seems to be of the same import with the rest. For first, the prophet there speaks of a "Child born and a Son given to us," to-wit, by God, according to these words of the angels to the shepherds, "To you is born this day a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord." And,

Secondly, It is prophesied that the "government shall be upon his shoulders;" and it is added, v. 7, that "of the increase of his government there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it;" whereas the kingdom of the great God of heaven is neither capable of increase

nor diminution, nor can that be called the throne of David. And,

It is farther said, that "the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this," that is, as Grotius interprets it, The love of God to mankind will induce him to send this son to us; so that this Governor seems plainly to be the same Jesus, of whom the angel speaks to the virgin Mary thus, Luke i. 32, 33, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Whatsoever, therefore, may be the sense of the titles here ascribed to this Son and Governor, it is certain from these things that they cannot import that he is the same God with the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth.

From all which places it is evident, that though the Jews neither owned nor expected any other God, yet they expected and were promised another King, another Lord, who was to reign over the house of David; and that this King was the Son of God, the Messiah, or Saviour, who was to give salvation to Israel, and was the messenger of the new covenant established in the blood of Jesus.

Now hence ariseth a full and sufficient answer to all the texts cited by Dr. Waterland, to prove what the wiser Jews owned, that there was but one God, and none other but he, Mark xii. 32. For though it be very certain that there neither is, nor can be more than *one* self-existing God, who alone has al perfections, and all dominion absolutely in and o himself, original, and underived, and independent on any; yet the Jews did, and from those scriptures had reason to, expect a King, who from this God was to receive the heathen for his inheritance, and

the utmost parts of the earth for his possession, and who is stiled his Son, set upon his holy hill of Sion; and a Son of man, to whom this God would give dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; who was the Lord whom they expected, even the Lord our righteousness.

Seeing, then, our blessed Lord Jesus Christ is in the New Testament still represented as that very person into whose hands the Father had committed all things, that Son "to whom all judgment is given, to whom he had given a power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to all those that God had given him; to whom he had given all power both in heaven and in earth, and whom he had made head over all things to his Church;" This must be the very person promised to the Jews in the Old Testament, and so must have a true dominion from the supreme Author of all dominion, and so be *verus Deus*, truly God, though not *summus Deus*, the supreme God, or God most high; and to ask whether Christ can be God at all, unless he be the same with the supreme God, is to ask whether the scripture has done rightly in stiling him God, when at the same time it is on all hands confessed that he is not he who alone has all perfections, and all dominion, absolutely in and of himself, original, underived, and independent on any; that is, he is not the first cause, the one God of whom are all things, 1 Cor. viii. 6, but that he is the Son of that God and Father of all.

THE two following Tracts, from the pen of the great and good Sir ISAAC NEWTON, will prove a most valuable part of this volume, to those readers who had been unacquainted with them. As they have not appeared in any work of common expence and circulation, they must be new to a vast majoriy of readers; and to every one seriously inquisitive after important truths, they must be highly interesting. Few, surely, can there be, who would read with any trivial interest what such a man was religiously induced to write, on any subject of general concern; and that the two points discussed are of that nature, to all Christian worshippers, will not be denied. The subject of the spurious text, 1 John v. 7, about which much has been said and written among churchmen, is abundantly important to be well understood, through an able and impartial medium; it having been long made the main foundation for an ambiguous Article of Faith, of which the reception has been deemed almost essential to salvation. A clear removal of such an assumed foundation, therefore, by so eminent and masterly an hand, must be particularly valuable.

The text, 1 Tim. iii. 16, having been urged with almost as much earnestness, in proof of the supreme godhead of Christ, (of which doctrine it has been considered as the chief corner-stone) the true rendering, and the arguments for it, from the same authority, must be equally important. It may be said by some, and perhaps chiefly by those to whom a strength of varied evidence is not desirable, that

these papers might have been abridged, and yet the substance in point retained. I admit they might have been shortened, and still have been made to retain sufficient evidence of the facts contended for. But it is no light matter to attempt an abridgment of a great writer; and few are the readers who could wish an abridgment of what so illustrious an expositor had deemed it useful to state on such topics. Moreover, in *justice* to the cause, and to the memory of so great a manager, I have determined not to epitomise the original; but that whoever reads, may have the privilege of reading as Sir ISAAC NEWTON wrote.

W. M.

AN

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT

OF

Two notable Corruptions of Scripture,

IN

A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

BY SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

Lately first published entire from the MS. in the Author's hand-writing, in the possession of Dr. EKENS, dean of Carlisle.

SINCE the discourses of some late writers have raised in you a curiosity of knowing the truth of that text of scripture concerning the testimony of the Three in heaven, 1 John v. 7, I have here sent you an account of what the reading has been in all ages, and by what steps it has been changed, so far as I can hitherto determine by records. And I have done it the more freely, because to you, who understand the many abuses which they of the Roman church have put upon the world, it will scarce be ungrateful to be convinced of one more than is commonly believed. For although the more learned and quick-sighted men (as Luther, Erasmus, Bullinger, Grotius, and some others) would not dissemble their knowledge, yet the generality are fond of the place for its making against heresy. But whilst we exclaim against the pious frauds of the Roman church, and make it a part of our reli-

gion to detect and renounce all things of that kind, we must acknowledge it a greater crime in us to favour such practices, than in the Papists we so much blame on that account: for they act according to their religion, but we contrary to ours. In the eastern nations, and for a long time in the western, the faith subsisted without this text; and it is rather a danger to religion, than an advantage, to make it now lean upon a bruised reed. There cannot be better service done to the truth, than to purge it of things spurious: and therefore knowing your prudence, and calmness of temper, I am confident I shall not offend you by telling you my mind plainly: especially since it is no article of faith, no point of discipline, nothing but a criticism concerning a text of scripture which I am going to write about.

II. The history of the corruption, in short, is this, first, some of the Latines interpreted the spirit, water, and blood of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to prove them one. Then Jerome, for the same end, inserted the Trinity in express words into his version. Out of him the Africans began to alledge it against the Vandals, about 64 years after his death. Afterwards the Latines noted his variations in the margins of their books; and thence it began at length to creep into the text in transcribing, and that chiefly in the twelfth and following centuries, when disputing was revived by the schoolmen. And when printing came up, it crept out of the Latine into the printed Greek, against the authority of all the Greek MSS. and ancient versions; and from the Venetian presses it went soon after into Greece. Now the truth of this history will appear by considering the arguments on both sides.

III. The arguments alledged for the testimony of the Three in heaven, are the authorities of Cyprian,

Athanasius, and Jerome, and of many Greek manuscripts, and almost all the Latine ones.

IV. Cyprian's words run thus—the Lord saith, "I and the Father am one." And again of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost it is written, "And these Three are One." The Socinians here deal too injuriously with Cyprian, while they would have this place corrupted: for Cyprian in another place repeats almost the same thing.[b] "If," saith he, ["one baptized among heretics] be made the temple of God, tell me, I pray, of what God? If of the Holy Ghost, since these Three are One, how can the Holy Ghost be reconciled to him who is the enemy of either the Father or the Son?" These places of Cyprian being, in my opinion, genuine, seem so apposite to prove the testimony of the Three in heaven, that I should never have suspected a mistake in it, could I but have reconciled it with the ignorance I meet with of this reading in the next age, amongst the Latines of both Africa and Europe, as well as among the Greeks. For had it been in Cyprian's bible, the Latines of the next age, when all the world was engaged in disputing about the Trinity, and all arguments that could be thought of were diligently sought out, and daily brought upon the stage, could never have been ignorant of a text, which in our age, now the dispute is over, is chiefly insisted upon. In reconciling this difficulty, I consider, therefore, that the only words of the text quoted by Cyprian in both places are,

[a] Dicit Dominus, ego et Pater unum sumus; et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, et tres unum sunt. *Cypr. de Unit. Eccles.*

[b] Si templum Dei factus est, quæso cujus Dei? Si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus ei esse potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est.—*Cypr. Epist.* 73, *ad Jubaianum.*

"And these Three are One:" which words may belong to the eighth verse as well as to the seventh. For Eucherius[c] bishop of Lion in France, and contemporary to St. Austin, reading the text without the seventh verse, tells us, that many then understood the spirit, the water, and the blood, to signify the Trinity. And St. Austin[d] is one of those many; as you may see in his third book against Maximus, where he tells us, "that the spirit is the Father, for God is a spirit: the water the Holy Ghost, for he is the water, which Christ gives to them that thirst: and the blood the Son; for the word was made flesh." Now if it was the opinion of many in the western churches of those times, that the spirit, the water, and the blood, signified the Father,

[c] Eucherius reads the text thus: "Tria sunt quæ testimonium perhibent; aqua, sanguis, et spiritus." And then adds this interpretation, "Plures hic ipsam, interpretatione mystica, intelligunt Trinitatem; eo quod perfecta ipsa perhibeat testimonium Christo: aqua, Patrem indicans; quia ipse de se dicit, me dereliquerunt fontem aquæ vivæ: sanguine, Christum demonstrans, utique per passionis cruorem: spiritu verò sanctum spiritum manifestans."—*Eucher. de Quæst. N. Test.*

[d] Sane falli te nolo in epistolâ Joannis Apostoli, ubi ait, "tres sunt testes, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt;" ne fortè dicas, spiritum et aquam et sanguinem diversas esse substantias, et tamen dictum esse, tres unum sunt. Propter hoc admonui te, ne fallaris: hæc enim sunt, in quibus non quid sint, sed quid ostendant, semper attenditur. Si vero ea, quæ his significata sunt, velimus inquirere; non absurdè occurrit ipsa Trinitas, quæ unus, solus, summus est Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus; de quibus verissimè dici potuit, tres sunt testes, et tres unum sunt: ut nomine spiritûs significatum accipiamus Deum Patrem, (de Deo ipso quippe adorando loquebatur dominus, ubi ait, spiritus est Deus) nomine autem sanguinis, Filium; quia verbum caro factum est: nomine autem aquæ, Spiritum Sanctum. Cùm enim de aquâ loqueretur Jesus, quam daturus erat sitientibus, ait evangelista; "hoc autem dicit de Spiritu, quem accepturi erant credentes in eum."—*D. Augustin. Cont. Maximum. Cap.* xxii.

the Son, and the Holy Ghost; it is plain that the testimomy of Three in heaven, in express words, was not yet crept into their books: and even without this testimony, it was obvious for Cyprian, or any man else of that opinion, to say of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, "And these Three are One." And that this was Cyprian's meaning, Facundus,[e] an African bishop in the sixth century, is my author; for he tells us expressly that Cyprian, in the above-mentioned place, understood it so, interpreting the spirit, water, and blood, to be the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and thence affirming that John said of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "these Three are One." This at least may be gathered from this passage of Facundus, that some in those early ages interpreted Cyprian after this manner. Nor do I understand how any

[e] Facundus, in the beginning of his book to the Emperor Justinian, pro Defensione trium Capitulorum Consilii Chalcedonensis, first recites the text after the manner of Cyprian, but more distinctly in these words: "Nam Joannes apostolus, in epistolâ suâ, de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto sic dicit, 'Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et hi tres unum sunt;' in spiritu significans Patrem, &c. Joan. iv. 21. In aquâ spiritum sanctum, Joan. vii. 37, in sanguine vero filium." And a little after he thus confirms this interpretation by Cyprian's authority, saying, "Aut si forsan ipsi, qui de verbo contendunt, in eo quod dixit, 'tres sunt qui testificantur in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt,' Trinitatem nolunt intelligi; secundum ipsa verba quæ posuit, pro apostolo Joanne respondeant. Numquid hi tres, qui in terrâ testificari, et qui unum esse dicuntur, possunt spiritus et aquæ et sanguines dici? Quod tamen Joannis apostoli testimonium B. Cyprianus Carthaginensis, antistes et martyr, in epistolâ sive libro quem de Trinitate, immo de unitate ecclesiæ scripsit, de Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto dictum intelligit: ait enim, dicit Dominus, ego et Pater unum sumus; et iterum de Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, "et hi tres unum sunt."—*Facund. l.* i. *p.* 16; *ex edit. Sirmondi Parisiis*, 1629.

of those many who took the spirit, water, and blood, for a type of the Trinity; or any man else, who was ignorant of the testimony of the Three in heaven, as the churches in the times of the Arian controversy generally were; could understand him otherwise. And even Cyprian's own words do plainly make for the interpretation. For he does not say, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, as it is now in the seventh verse; but the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, as it is in baptism; the place from which they tried[f] at first to derive the Trinity. If it be pretended, that the words cited by Cyprian are taken out of the seventh verse, rather than out of the eighth; because he reads not, "*Hi Tres in Unum sunt*," but "*Hi Tres Unum sunt;*" I answer that the Latines generally read, "*Hi Tres Unum sunt*," as well in the eighth verse as in the seventh; as you may see in the newly-cited places of St. Austin and Facundus, and those of Ambrose, Pope Leo, Beda, and Cassiodoris, which follow, and in the present vulgar Latine. So then the testimony of Cyprian respects the eighth, or at least is as applicable to that verse as to the seventh, and therefore is of no force for proving the truth of the seventh: but on the contrary, for disproving it we have here the testimony of Facundus, St. Austin, Eucherius, and those many others whom Eucherius mentions. For if those of that age had met with it in their books, they would never have understood the spirit, the water, and the blood, to be the Three persons of the Trinity, in order to prove them one God.

[f] The insinuation contained in this expression, that the Trinity is not to be derived from the words prescribed for the baptismal form, is very extraordinary to come from a writer who was no Socinian.

V. These passages in Cyprian may receive further light by a like passage in Tertullian, from whence Cyprian seems to have borrowed them; for it is well known that Cyprian was a great admirer of Tertullian's writings, and read them frequently, calling Tertullian his master. The passage is this:[8] "The connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the paraclete, makes three coherent ones from one another, which Three are One, (one thing, not one person) as it is said, 'I and the Father are One;' denoting the unity of substance, not the singularity of number." Here, you see, Tertullian says not, "the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost," as the text now has it, "but the Father, Son, and Paraclete;" nor cites any thing more of the text than these words, "which Three are One." Though this treatise against St. Praxeas be wholly spent in discoursing about the Trinity, and all texts of scripture are cited to prove it, and this text of St. John, as we now read it, would have been one of the most obvious and apposite to have been cited at large, yet Tertullian could find no more obvious words in it for his purpose than "these Three are One." These, therefore, he interprets of the Trinity, and inforces the interpretation by that other text, "I and the Father are One;" as if the phrase was of the same importance in both places.

VI. So then this interpretation seems to have been invented by the Montanists for giving countenance to their Trinity. For Tertullian was a Montanist, when he wrote this; and it is most likely that so corrupt and forced an interpretation had its

[8] Connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero, "qui Tres Unum sunt," (non Unus) quomodo dictum est, "Ego et Pater Unum sumus;" ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.—*Tertullian advers. Prax.* c. 25.

rise among a sect of men accustomed to make bold with the scriptures. Cyprian being used to it in his master's writings, it seems from thence to have dropt into his: for this may be gathered from the likeness between their citations. And by the disciples of these two great men, it seems to have been propagated among those many Latins, who (as Eucherius tells us) received it in the next age, understanding the Trinity by the "spirit, water, and blood." For how, without the countenance of some such authority, an interpretation so corrupt and strained should come to be received in that age so generally, I do not understand.

VII. And what is said of the testimony of Tertullian and Cyprian, may be much more said of that in the feigned disputation of Athanasius with Arius at Nice. For there the words cited are only "και οι τρεις το εν εισιν," and "these Three are One;"[h] and they are taken out of the seventh verse, without naming the persons of the Trinity before them. For the Greeks interpreted "the spirit, water, and blood" of the Trinity, as well as the Latins; as is manifest from the annotations they made on this text in the margin of some of their manuscripts. For father Simon informs us that in one of the MSS. in the library of the king of France, marked numb. 2247, over against these words, "οτι τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τη γη[i] το πνευμα και το υδωρ και το αιμα." "For there are Three that bear record [in earth,] the spirit, the water, and the blood:" there is this remark, "τουτεστι το πνευμα το αγιον, και ο Πατηρ, και αυτος εαυτω;" that is, "the Holy Ghost, and the Father, and He of Himself." And in the same copy over against these words, "και οι τρεις εις το εν εισι," "and these Three are One;" this note is added, "τουτεστι

[h] Critical history of N. Test. cap. 18.

[i] Suspicor verba εν τη γη non extare in MS.

μια θεότης, εις θεος." That is, "One Deity, One God." This MS. is about 500 years old.

VIII. Also in the margin of one of the MSS. in Monsieur Colbert's library, numb. 871, father Simon tells us there is a like remark. For besides these words, "εις θεος, μια θεότης," "One God, One Godhead;" there are added, "μαρτυρια του θεου του πατρος και του αγιου πνευματος," "The testimony of God the Father, and of the Holy Ghost." These marginal notes sufficiently shew how the Greeks used to apply this text to the Trinity; and by consequence how the author of that disputation is to be understood. But I should tell you also, that that disputation was not writ by Athanasius, but by a later author, and therefore, as a spurious piece, uses not to be much insisted upon.

IX. Now this mystical application of "the spirit, water, and blood, to signify the Trinity, seems to me to have given occasion to somebody, either fraudulently to insert the testimony of "the Three in heaven," in express words into the text, for proving the Trinity; or else to note it in the margin of his book, by way of interpretation; whence it might afterwards creep into the text in transcribing. And the first upon record that inserted it, is Jerome; if the preface[k] to the canonical epistles, which goes

[k] The whole preface runs thus: "Incipit prologus in epistolas canonicas. Non ita est ordo apud Græcos, qui integrè sapiunt, fideique rectam sectantur, epistolarum septem, quæ canonicæ nuncupantur, sicut in Latinis codicibus invenitur: ut quia Petrus est primus in ordine apostolorum, primæ sint etiam ejus epistolæ in ordine ceterarum. Sed sicut evangelistas dedum ad veritatis lineam correximus, ita has proprio ordini, Deo juvante, reddidimus. Est enim una earum prima Jacobi, duæ Petri, tres Johannis, et Judæ una. Quæ si sicut ab eis digestæ sunt, ita quoque ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium, nec ambiguitatem legentibus facerent, nec sermonum sese varietates

under his name, be his. For whilst he composed not a new translation of the New Testament, but only corrected the ancient vulgar Latin, (as learned men think) and among his emendations (written perhaps at first in the margin of his book) he inserted this testimony; he complains in the said preface, how he was thereupon accused[1] by some of the Latins for falsifying scripture; and makes answer, that former Latin translators had much erred from the faith, in putting only "the spirit, water, and blood," in their edition, and omitting the testimony of "the Three in heaven," whereby the Catholic faith is established. In this defence he seems to say, that he corrected the vulgar Latin translation by the original Greek; and this is the great testimony the text relies upon.

impugnarent, illo præcipue loco ubi de Unitate Trinitatis in primâ Johannis epistolâ, positum legimus, &c. In quâ etiam ab infidelibus translatoribus, multum erratum esse à fidei veritate comperimus, trium tantummodo vocabula, hoc est, aquæ, sanguinis, et spiritûs, in ipsâ suâ editione ponentibus: et Patris, Verbique, ac Spiritûs testimonium omittentibus; in quo maxime et fides catholica roboratur, et Patris, ac Filii, et Spiritûs una divinitatis substantia comprobatur. In cæteris verò epistolis, quantum à nostrâ aliorum distet editio, lectoris judicio derelinquo. Sed tu, virgo Christi Eustochium, dum à me impensius scripturæ veritatem inquiris, meam quodammodo senectutem invidorum dentibus corrodendam exponis, qui me falsarium, corruptoremque sanctarum pronunciant scripturarum. Sed ego, in tali opere, nec æmulorum meorum invidiam pertimesco, nec sanctæ scripturæ veritatem poscentibus denegabo."

[1] Jerome complains not of any accusation raised upon what he had done in this or any other particular text of scripture. He affirms, that this text was unfaithfully rendered in the Latin bibles, which were current in his time before his own edition. That his edition, in this as well as in other passages, faithfully represented the original Greek; and he expresses an apprehension, that the number of his emendations, which the infidelity of former translators had rendered necessary, might furnish his enemies with a pretence for abuse.

X. But whilst he confesses it was not in the Latin before, and accuses former translators of falsifying the scriptures in omitting it, he satisfies us that it has crept into the Latin since his time, and so cuts off all the authority of the present vulgar Latin for justifying it. And whilst he was accused by his contemporaries of falsifying the scriptures in inserting it, this accusation also confirms, that he altered the public reading. For had the reading been dubious before he made it so, no man would have charged him with falsification for following either part. Also, whilst upon this accusation, he recommends the alteration by its usefulness for establishing the Catholic faith, this renders it the more suspected; by discovering both the design of his making it, and the ground of his hoping for success. However, seeing he was thus accused by his cnotemporaries, it gives us just reason to examine the business between him and his accusers. And so, he being called to the bar, we are not to lay stress upon his own testimony for himself (for no man is a witness in his own cause) but laying aside all prejudice, we ought, according to the ordinary rules of justice, to examine the business between him and his accusers by other witnesses.

XI. They that have been conversant in his writings, observe a strange liberty which he takes in asserting things. Many notable instances of this he has left us in composing those very fabulous lives of Paul and Hilarian, not to mention what he has written upon other occasions. Whence Erasmus said of him, that he was in affirming things, "frequently violent and impudent, and often contrary to himself."[m] But I accuse him not. It is possi-

[m] Sæpe numero violentus, parumque pudens, sæpe varius, parumque sibi constans.—*Erasmi Annotation. in Johan. v. 7.* Vide etiam quæ Erasmus contra Leum in hunc locum de Hieronymo fusius dixit.

ble that he might be sometimes imposed upon, or, through inadvertency, commit a mistake. Yet since his contemporaries accused him, it is but just that we should lay aside the prejudice of his great name, and hear the cause impartially between them.

XII. Now the witnesses between them are partly the ancient translators of the scriptures into the various languages; partly the writers of his own age, and of the ages next before and after him; and partly the scribes, who have copied out the Greek manuscripts of the scriptures in all ages. And all these are against him. For by the unanimous evidence of all these, it will appear that the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was wanting in the Greek manuscripts, from whence Jerome, or whoever was the author of that preface to the canonical epistles, pretends to have borrowed it.

XIII. The ancient interpreters, which I cite as witnesses against him, are chiefly the authors of the ancient vulgar Latin, of the Syriac, and the Æthiopic versions. For as he tells us, that the Latines omitted the testimony of "the Three in heaven" in their version before his time, so in the Syriac and Æthiopic versions, (both which, from bishop Walton's account of them, are much ancienter than Jerome's time, being the versions which the oriental Æthiopic nations received from the beginning, and generally used, as the Latines did the vulgar Latin) that same testimony is wanting to this day; and the authors of these three most ancient, most famous, and most received versions, by omitting it, are concurrent witnesses, that they found it wanting in the original Greek manuscripts of their own times. It is wanting also in other ancient versions: as in the Egyptian Arabic, published in Walton's Polyglot; in the Armenian ver-

sion,[n] used ever since Chrysostom's age, by the Armenian nations; and in the Illyrican[o] of Cyrillus, used in Rascia, Bulgaria, Moldavia, Russia, Muscovy, and other countries, which use the Sclavonic tongue. In a copy of this version,[o] printed at Ostrobe (Ostrow) in Volhinia, in the year 1581, I have seen it wanting; and one Camillus[p] relates the same thing out of ancient manuscripts of this version seen by him. Father Simon notes it wanting also in a certain version of the French church, which, saith he, is at least 1000 years old, and which was published by father Mabillon, a Benedictine monk. Nor do I know of any version wherein it is extant, except the modern vulgar Latin, and such modern versions, of the western nations, as have been influenced by it. So then, by the unanimous consent of all the ancient and faithful interpreters, which we have hitherto met with (who doubtless made use of the best manuscripts they could get) the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was not anciently in the Greek.

XIV. And that it was neither in the ancient versions nor in the Greek, but was wholly unknown to the first churches, is most certain by an argument hinted above; namely, that in all that vehement,

[n] Codex Armeniacus ante 400 annos exaratus, quem vidi apud Episcopum Ecclesiæ Armeniacæ, quæ Amstelodami colligitur, locum illum non legit.—*Sandius Append. Interpret. Paradox. in h. l.*

[o] The printed Sclavonic version runs thus: "Quia Tres sunt qui testificantur, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis; et Tres in Unum sunt. Si testimonium, &c."

[p] Testimonium trium in cœlo non est in antiquissimus Illyricorum et Ruthenorum codicibus; quorum unum exemplar, à sexcentis fere annis manuscriptum, jampridem apud illustrissimum Gabrielem Chineum, terræ Bactricæ Dominum vidi, et legi: alterum manibus nostris teritur, fide et antiquitate suâ nobile.—*Camillus de Antichristo, lib.* ii. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 156.

universal, and lasting controversy about the Trinity in Jerome's time, and both before and long enough after it, this text of "the Three in heaven" was never once thought of. It is now in every body's mouth, and accounted the main text for the business, and would assuredly have been so too with them, had it been in their books. And yet it is not once to be met with in all the disputes, epistles, orations, and other writings of the Greeks and Latins (Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, the council of Sardica, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Hilary, Ambrose, Austin, Victorinus Afer, Philastrius Brixiensis, Phæbedius Agennensis, Gregorius Bæticus, Faustinus Diaconus, Paschasius, Arnobius Junior, Cerealis, and others) in the times of those controversies; no, not in Jerome himself; if his version and preface to the canonical epistles be excepted. The writings of those times were very many, and copious; and there is no argument, or text of scripture, which they do not urge again and again. That of St. John's gospel, "I and the Father am One," is every where inculcated, but this of "the Three in heaven, and their being One," is no where to be met with, till at length, when the ignorant ages came on, it began by degrees to creep into the Latin copies out of Jerome's version. So far are they from citing the testimony of "the Three in heaven," that, on the contrary, as often as they have occasion to mention the place, they omit it, and that too, as well after Jerome's age, as in, and before it. For Hesychius[q] cites the place thus: "*Audi Johannem dicentem, Tria sunt qui testimonium præbent, et Tres Unum sunt, spiritus, et sanguis, et aqua.*" The words *in terrâ* he omits, which is never done, but in copies where "the

[q] Hesych. in Levit. lib. ii. c. 8. post med.

Three in heaven" is wanting. Cassiodorus, or whoever was the author of the Latin version of the discourse of Clemens Alexandrinus on these epistles of St. John, reads it thus: "*Quia tres sunt, qui testificantur, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis, et hi Tres Unum sunt.*"[r] Beda, in his commentary on the place, reads it thus: "*Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam Christus est veritas. Quoniam Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et Tres Unum sunt. Si testimonium, &c.*" But here the words *in terrâ*, so far as I can gather from his commentary on this text, have been inserted by some latter hand. The author of the first epistle, ascribed to Pope Eusebius, reads it, as Beda doth, omitting only the words *in terrâ*. And if the authority of popes be valuable, Pope Leo the Great, in his tenth epistle, thus cites the place: "*Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quonium spiritus est veritas; quia Tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis; et hi Tres Unum sunt.*" St. Ambrose, in the sixth chapter of his first book, *De Spiritu Sancto*, disputing for the unity of the Three Persons, says, "*Hi Tres Unum sunt, Johannes dixit, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus: Unum in mysterio, non in naturâ.*" This is all he could find of the text, while he was disputing about the Trinity, and therefore he proves the unity of the persons by the mystical unity of the spirit, water, and blood: interpreting those of the Trinity with Cyprian and others. Yea, in the eleventh chapter of his third book, he fully recites the text thus: "*Per aquam et sanguinem venit Christus Jesus, non solum in aquâ, sed in aquâ et sanguine; et spiritus testimonium dat, quoniam spiritus est veritas. Quia Tres sunt testes, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et*

[r] Cassiodor. in Bibl. S. Patr. edit. Paris, 1589.

hi Tres Unum sunt in Christo Jesu."[s] The like reading of Facundus, Eucherius, and St. Austin, you have in the places cited above. These are Latins as late, or later, than Jerome; for Jerome did not prevail with the churches of his own time to receive the testimony of "the Three in heaven." And for them to know his version, and not receive his testimony, was in effect to condemn it.

XV. And as for the Greeks, Cyril of Alexandria reads the text without this testimony in the xivth book of his Thesaurus, cap. 5; and again in his first book *De Fide ad Reginas,* a little after the middle; and so does Oecumenius, a later Greek, in his commentary on this place of St. John's epistle. Also, Didymus Alexandrinus, in his commentary on the same passage, reads, "the spirit, water, and blood," without mentioning "the Three in heaven:" and so he doth in his book of the Holy Ghost, where he seems to omit nothing that he could find for his purpose: and so doth Gregory Nazianzen in his xxxviith oration concerning the Holy Ghost; and also Nicetas in his commentary on Gregory Nazianzen's xlivth oration: And here it is farther observable, that, as the Eusebians had contended, that "the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," were not to be connumerated, because they were things of a different kind; Nazianzen and Nicetas answer, that they may be connumerated, because St. John connumerates three things not substantial, namely, "the spirit, the water, and the blood." By the objection of the Eusebians, it then appears that the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was not in their books; and by the answer of the Catholics it is as evident, that it was not in theirs; for while they answer by instancing "the spirit, water, and blood," they

[s] See also Ambrose in Luc. xxii. 10, and in his book, De iis qui mysteriis initiantur, cap. 4.

could not have missed of "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost;" had they been connumerated, and called one in the words immediately before; and to answer by instancing in these, would have been far more to their purpose, because it was the very thing in question. In like manner the Eunomians, in disputing against the Catholics, had objected, that the Holy Ghost is no where in scripture conjoined with the Father and the Son, except in the form of baptism: which is as much as to say, that the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was not in their books: and yet St. Basil,[t] whilst he is very diligent in returning an answer to them, and perplexes himself in citing places, which are nothing to the purpose, does not produce this text of "the Three in heaven," though it be the most obvious, and the only proper passage, had it been then in the scriptures; and therefore he knew nothing of it. The objection of the Eunomians, and the answer of the Catholics, sufficiently shew that it was in the books of neither party. Besides all this, the tenth epistle of Pope Leo, mentioned above, was that very famous epistle to Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, against Eutyches, which went about through all the churches, both eastern and western, being translated into Greek, and sent about in the east by Flavian. It was generally applauded in the west, and read in the council of Chalcedon, and there solemnly approved and subscribed by all the bishops; and in this epistle the text was thus cited: "*Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam Christus est veritas: quia Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et hi Tres Unum sunt.*" And by putting πνευμα (according to the Greek reading) for *Christus*, which is still the vulgar Latin, it was thus trans-

[t] Lib. 5, adversus Eunomium sub fidem.

lated by the Greeks: "και το πνευμα εςιν το μαρτυρουν· επειδη το πνευμα εςιν ἡ αληθεια· τρεις γαρ εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες, το πνευμα, και το υδωρ, και το αιμα, και οι τρεις το εν εισι." So then we have the reading, quoted by the Pope, owned in the west, and solemnly subscribed in the east by the fourth general council, and therefore it continued the public received reading in both the east and west, till after the age of that council.

XVI. So then the testimony of "the Three in heaven," which, in the times of these controversies, would have been in every body's mouth, had it been in their books, was wholly unknown to the churches of those ages. All that they could find in their books was the testimony of "the water, spirit, and the blood." Will you now say, that the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was razed out of their books by the prevailing Arians? Yes, truly, those Arians were crafty knaves, that could conspire so cunningly and slily all the world over at once (as at the word of a Mithridates) in the latter end of the reign of the emperor Constantius, to get all men's books in their hands, and correct them without being perceived: ay, and conjurors too, to do it without leaving any blot or chasm in their books, whereby the knavery might be suspected and discovered; and to wipe away the memory of it out of all men's brains, so that neither Athanasius, or any body else, could afterwards remember that they had ever seen it in their books before; and out of their own books too; so that when they turned to the con-substantial faith, as they generally did in the west, soon after the death of Constantius, they could then remember no more of it than any body else. Well, then, it was out of their books in Jerome's age, when he pretended it was in; which is the point we are to prove; and when any body can shew, that it was in their books before, it may be

pertinent to consider that point also: but till then we are only to enquire how, since it was out, it came into the copies that are now extant. For they that, without proof, accuse the heretics of corrupting books, and upon that pretence correct them at their pleasure without the authority of ancient manuscripts, as some learned men of the fourth and fifth centuries used to do, are falsaries by their own confession, and certainly need no other confutation. And therefore if this reading was once out, we are bound in justice to believe, that it was out from the beginning; unless the razing of it out can be proved by some better argument than that of pretence and clamour.

XVII. Will you now say, that Jerome followed some copy different from any which the Greeks were acquainted with? This is to overthrow the authority of his version by making him depart from the received Greeks; and besides, it is contrary to what he himself seems to represent; for in his blaming not the vulgar Greek copies, but the Latin interpreters only, which were before his time, as if they had varied from the received Greek, he represents that he himself followed it. He does not excuse and justify himself for reading differently from the received Greek, to follow a private copy, but accuses former interpreters, as if, in leaving out the testimony of "the Three in heaven," they had not followed the received Greek, as he did. And therefore, since the Greeks knew nothing of this testimony, the authority of his version sinks; and that the rather, because he was then accused of corrupting the text, and could not persuade either the Greeks or the Latines of those times to receive his reading; for the Latines received it not till many years after his death; and the Greeks not till this present age, when the Venetians sent it amongst

them in printed books: and their not receiving it was plainly to approve the accusation.

XVIII. The authority of this version being thus far discussed, it remains, that we consider the authority of the manuscripts, wherein we now read the testimony of "the Three in heaven." And by the best inquiry that I have been able to make, it is wanting in the manuscripts of all languages but the Latin. For, as we have shewn, that the Æthiopic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and Sclavonian versions, still in use in the several eastern nations, Ethiopia, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Muscovy, and some others, are strangers to this reading, and that it was anciently wanting also in the French: so I am told by those who have been in Turkey, that it is wanting to this day in the Greek manuscripts, which have been brought from those parts into the west; and that the Greeks, now that they have got it in print from the Venetians, when their manuscripts are objected against it, pretend that the Arians razed it out. A reading to be found in no manuscripts but the Latin, and not in the Latin before Jerome's age, as Jerome himself confesses, can be but of little authority: and this authority sinks, because we have already proved the reading spurious, by shewing, that it was heretofore unknown, both to the western and the eastern churches, in the times of the great controversy about the Trinity. But, however, for further satisfaction, we shall now give you an account of the Latin and Greek manuscripts; and shew, first, how, in the dark ages, it crept into the Latin manuscripts out of Jerome's version; and then how it lately crept out of the Latin into the printed Greek without the authority of MSS.; those who first published it in Greek, having never yet so much as seen it in any Greek manuscript.

XIX. That the vulgar Latin, now in use, is a mixture of the old vulgar Latin, and Jerome's version together, is the received opinion. Few of these manuscripts are above four or five hundred years old. The latest generally have the testimony of "the Three in heaven:" the oldest of all usually want it, which shews that it has crept in by degrees. Erasmus notes it to be wanting in three very ancient ones, one of which was in the Pope's library at Rome, the other two were at Bruges; and he adds, that in another manuscript belonging to the library of the Minorites in Antwerp, the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was noted in the margin in a newer hand. Peter Cholinus notes in the margin of his Latin edition of the scriptures, printed anno Christi 1543 and 1544, that it was wanting in the most ancient manuscript of the Tugurine library. Dr. Gilbert Burnet has lately, in the first letter of his travels, noted it wanting in five other ones kept at Strasburgh, Zurich, and Bazil: one of which MSS. he reckons about 1000 years old, and the other four about 800. F. Simon has noted it wanting in five others in the libraries of the king of France, Mons. Colbert, and the Benedictines of the abbey of St. Germain's. An ancient and diligent collator of manuscripts, cited by Lucas Brugensis by the name of Epanorthotes, notes in general, that it was wanting in the ancient Latin manuscripts. Lucas himself, collating many Latin ones, notes it to be wanting in only *five*, that is, in the few old ones he had, his manuscripts being almost all of them new ones. For he praises[u] the Codex Lobiensis written anno Christi 1084, and the Codex Tornacensis written anno Christi 1105, as most ancient and venerable for their antiquity; and used others much more new, of which a great

[u] Lucas Brug. in calce annot.

number was easily had; such as was the Codex Buslidianus, written anno Christi 1432, that is, but eight years before the invention of printing. The Lateran council, collected under Innocent the Third, anno Christi 1215, canon 2, mentions Joachim, the abbot, quoting the text in these words: "*Quoniam in canonica Johannis epistola, quia Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cœla, Pater, et Verbum, et Spiritus, et hi Tres Unum sunt: statimque subjungitur—Et Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et Tres Unum sunt: sicut in codicibus quibusdam invenitur.*" This was written by Joachim[w] in the papacy of Alexander the Third, that is, in or before the year 1180, and therefore this reading was then got but into some books; for the words "*sicut in codicibus quibusdam invenitur*" refer as well to the first words of Joachim, "*quoniam in canonica Johannis epistola legitur,*" as to the text "*statimque subjungitur;*" and more to the first than the text, because the first part of the citation was then but in some books, as appears by ancient manuscripts; but the second part was in almost all: the words "*Tres Unum sunt*" being in all the books which wanted the testimony of "the Three in heaven," and in most of those which had it; though afterwards left out in many, when branded by the schoolmen for Arian.

XX. But to go to the original of the corruption. Gregory the great[x] writes, that Jerome's version was in use in his time, and therefore no wonder if the testimony of "the Three in heaven" began to be cited out of it before. Eugenius bishop of Carthage, in the seventh year of Hunneric king of the Vandals, anno Christi 484, in the summary of his

[w] Vide Math. Paris Histor. Angl. A.D. 1179.
[x] Vide Walton's Prolegomena, x 5.

faith exhibited to the king, cited it the first of any man, so far as I can find. A while after Fulgentius, another African bishop, disputing against the same Vandals, cited it again, and backed it with the fore-mentioned place of Cyprian, applied to the testimony of "the Three in heaven." And so it is probable, that by that abused authority of Cyprian it began first in Afric, in the disputes with the ignorant Vandals, to get some credit; and thence at length crept into use. It occurs also frequently in Vigilius Tapsensis, another African bishop, contemporary to Fulgentius. In its defence, some allege earlier writers; namely, the first epistle of Pope Hyginus, the first epistle of Pope John II. the book of Idacius Clarus against Varimadus; and the book, *De unita Deitate Trinitatis*, ascribed to Athanasius. But Chiffletius, who published the works of Victor Vitensis and Vigilius Tapsensis, sufficiently proves the book against Varimadus to be this Vigilius's, and erroneously ascribed to Idacius. To the same Vigilius he asserts also the book *De unita Deitate Trinitatis.* Certainly Athanasius was not its author. All the epistles of Hyginus, except the beginning and the end, and the first part of the epistle of Pope John, wherein the testimony of "the Three in heaven" is cited, are nothing else than fragments of the book against Varimadus, described word by word by some forger of decretal epistles, as may appear by comparing them. So then Eugenius is the first upon record that quotes it.

XXI. But though he set it on foot among the Africans, yet I cannot find that it became of authority in Europe before the revival of learning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In those ages St. Barnard, the Schoolmen, Joachim, and the Lateran council, spread it abroad, and scribes began

generally to insert it into the text: but in such Latin manuscripts and European writers, as are ancienter than those times, it is scarce to be met with.

XXII. Now that it was inserted into the vulgar Latin out of Jerome's version, is manifest by the manner how the vulgar Latin and that version came to be mixed. For it is agreed that the Latines, after Jerome's version began to be of use, noted out of it his corrections of the vulgar Latin in the margin of their books; and these the transcribers afterwards inserted into the text. By this means, the old Latin has been so generally corrected, that it is no where to be found sincere. It is Jerome that we now read, and not the old vulgar Latin; and what wonder, if in Jerome we read the testimony of "the Three in heaven?" For who that inserted the rest of Jerome into the text, would leave out such a passage for the Trinity, as this hath been taken to be?

XXIII. But to put the question out of dispute, there are footsteps of the insertion still remaining. For in some old manuscripts, it has been found noted in the margin; in others, the various readings are such as ought to arise, by transcribing it out of the margin into the text. I shall only mention the three following varieties. Of the manuscripts which have not the testimony of "the Three in heaven," some have the words *in terra*, in the eighth verse, but the most want it; which seems to proceed from hence, that some, before they allowed so great an addition to the text, as the testimony of "the Three in heaven" noted only *in terra* in the margin of their books, to be inserted into the testimony of the spirit, water, and blood. Of the manuscripts which have the testimony of "the Three in heaven," some in the eighth verse have "*hi Tres Unum sunt.*" Others not. The reason

of this seems to be, that of those who noted this testimony in the margin, some blotted out "*Et hi Tres Unum sunt*" in the eighth verse, according to Jerome; and others did not. And, lastly, the testimony of "the Three in heaven" is in most books set before the testimony of "the Three in earth;" in some, it is set after. So Erasmus notes two old books, in which it is set after; Lucus Brugensis a third; and Hesselius (if I misremember not) a fourth; and so Vigilius Tapsensis[y] sets it after: which seems to proceed from hence, that it was sometimes so noted in the margin, that the reader or transcriber knew not whether it were to come before or after. Now these discords in the Latin manuscripts, as they detract from the authority of the manuscripts, so they confirm to us, that the old vulgar Latin has in these things been tampered with, and corrected by Jerome's version.

XXIV. In the next place, I am to shew how, and when, the testimony of "the Three in heaven" crept out of the Latin into the Greek. Those who first printed the Greek testament, did generally, in following their manuscripts, omit the testimony of "the Three in heaven," except in Spain; for it was omitted in the first and second edition of Erasmus, anno Christi 1516 and 1519: in the edition of Francis Asulan, printed at Venice by Aldus, anno Christi 1518: in that of Nicholas Gerbelius, printed at Haganau, anno Christi 1521: and a little after, in that of Wolfius Cephalius, printed at Strasbourg, anno Christi 1524: and again in 1526, in the Badian edition, as Erasmus notes; and in that of Simon Colinæus at Paris, anno Christi 1534.[z]

[y] Vigilius libr. advers. Varimadum, cap. 5.

[z] "In editis exemplaribus nonnullis non legi: ut in Aldinâ et Badianâ editione.—Addo, nec in Græco Testamento Gerbelii Haganoæ, 1521; nec in Colinæi Parisiis edito." *Gomarus in h.*

At the same time it was omitted in some editions of other western languages, as in the Saxon and German editions of Luther; and in the Latin Tugurine editions of Peter Cholins, anno Christi 1543 and 1544. The first edition in Greek, which has the testimony of "the Three in heaven," was that of Cardinal Ximenes, printed at Complutum in Spain, in 1515; but not published before the year 1521. The cardinal, in his edition, used the assistance of several divines, which he called together to Complutum, there founding an university, anno Christi 1517, or a little before. Two of those divines were Antonius Nebrissensis and Stunica. For Stunica then resided at Complutum, and in the preface[a] to a treatise he wrote against Erasmus, gives this testimony of himself; "That he had spent some years in reading the holy scriptures in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; and had diligently collated the Hebrew and Greek exemplars with the Latin copies." This book, displeasing the cardinal, was not printed till after his death; and then it came forth at Complutum, anno Christi 1520. The year before, one Lee, an Englishman, writ also against Erasmus; and both Stunica and Lee, amongst other things, reprehended him for omitting the testimony of "the Three in heaven." Afterwards Erasmus, finding the Spaniards, and some others of the Roman Church, in a heat against

[a] "Cum præsertim, si quisquam alius; et nos quoque his de rebus, nostro quodam jure, judicium ferre possumus, [Quippe] qui non paucos annos in sanctis scripturis veteris et Novi Testamenti, Hebraicè, Græcè, et Latinè perlegendis consumpserimus; ac Hebraica, Græcaque ipsa divinarum literarum exemplaria cum Latinis codicibus diligentissimè contulerimus. Longâ igitur lectione ac experientia jampridem edocti, quantum tralationi huic ecclesiasticæ Novi Testamenti deferendum sit, ni fallor, optime novi."—*Hac Stunica in proem. libri sui.*

him, printed this testimony in his third edition, anno Christi 1522, representing, "That in his former editions he had printed the text as he found it in his manuscripts; but now there being found in England one manuscript which had the testimony of 'the Three in heaven,' he had inserted it, according to that manuscript; for avoiding the calumnies raised against him." And so it continued in two following editions. And at length Robert Stephens, anno Christi 1550, reprinted Erasmus's edition, with some few alterations, and various lections, taken out of the Complutensian edition, and fifteen Greek manuscripts, which he named after the numeral letters, α, β, γ, δ, ε, &c. putting α for the Complutensian edition, and β, γ, δ, ε, &c. for the manuscripts in order; and noting in the margin, that the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was wanting in the seven manuscripts, δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, ια, ιγ. Whence Beza[b] tells us, that he had read it in the rest. His words are "*Legit Hieronymus, legit Erasmus in Britannico codice, et in Complutensi editione. Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti nostri veteribus libris.*" And this is the original and authority of the printed editions. For these are the editions ever since followed by all the west; and of late years propagated by the Venetian presses into Greece; and nothing further, that I know of, has been discovered in any manuscripts in favour of these editions.

XXV. Now to pull off the vizard, I cannot but, in the first place, extremely complain of Beza's want of modesty and caution in expressing himself.[c] In the preface to his annotations, describing what

[b] Beza in hunc locum.

[c] "Non desunt, qui Bezam nimis audacem fuisse judicant, dum à receptâ lectione sæpius sine necessitate recedit; et unius, interdum nullius, codicis authoritate fretus, prætoriam

helps he had in composing his first edition, he tells us, "That he had the annotations of Valla, Stapulensis, and Erasmus, and the writings of the ancients and moderns collated by himself; and out of Stephens's library, the exemplar, which Stephens had collated with about twenty-five manuscripts, almost all of which were printed." He should have said seventeen; for that number he puts in other places, and in his annotations cites no more. So then he had the collations of two more manuscripts than Stephens has given us in print. And this was all his furniture. The original manuscripts he does not here pretend to have; nor could he have them: for they were not Stephens's manuscripts; but belonged to several libraries in France and Italy. The manuscript ϛ Stephens himself never saw; but had only various lections collected out of it by his friends in Italy. The manuscripts γ, δ, ε, ϛ, ζ, η, ι, ιε, were not Stephens's, but belonged to the library of the king of France, to whom Stephens was printer. The other six books, θ, ια, ιϛ, ιγ, ιδ, ιϛ, Stephens had not out of his own library, but borrowed them for a time from several places to collate, his friends studying to promote the design of his edition. And yet Beza in his annotations, when he would favour any text, cites the collations of Stephens in such a manner, as if he had the very original manuscripts at Geneva before his eyes. And where Stephens does not cite various lections, there he reckons, that in the text of Stephens's collated books he read all the manuscripts. So in Mark vi. 11, where Stephens notes a certain period to be wanting in the manuscript copies ϛ and ϟ, Beza saith, "*Hæc periodus in omnibus exemplaribus Græcis legitur,*

exercet potestatem, ex conjecturis mutando et interpolando textum sacrum pro lubitu."—*Walton Prolegom.* iv. *sect.* 15. *in Bibl. Polyglott.*

exceptis secundo et octavo." In the Acts xiii. 33, because Stephens had noted no various lections, Beza affirms of the Greek text, "*Ita scriptum invenimus in omnibus vetustis codicibus.*" In 1 John iv. 3, where Stephens is silent, Beza speaks, "*Sic legitur in omnibus Græcis exemplaribus, quæ quidem mihi inspicere licuit.*" In James i. 22, where Stephens is again silent, Beza tells us of the word μονον, "*Ego in omnibus nostris vetustis libris inveni.*" And so, where Stephens in the margin had noted the testimony of "the Three in heaven" to be wanting in seven manuscripts, he thinks that, in reading the text of Stephens's collated book, he reads it in the rest; and so tells us "*Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti Stephani codicibus.*" This he did in the first edition of his annotations. Afterwards, when he had got two real manuscripts, the Claromontan, and that which at length he presented to the University of Cambridge (in both which the canonical epistles are wanting;) in the epistle to his fourth edition, in reckoning up the books he then used, he put only these two, and the seventeen of Stephens; and in his fifth edition he writes summarily, that he used nineteen manuscripts, joining with those two real ones the collations of Stephens, as if in those he had seventeen others; which sufficiently explains his way of speaking in his annotations. But whilst he had not the manuscripts themselves to read with his own eyes, it was too hard and unwarrantable a way of speaking to tell us, "*Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti Stephani codicibus;*" and therefore, in his later editions, he corrects himself, and tells us only, that the reading doth "*extare in nonnullis Stephani veteribus libris.*" Thus Beza argues from Stephens's book of collations; and the same inference has been made by Lucas Brugensis, and

others, ever since from Stephens's forementioned edition of that book. "For," say they, "Stephens had fifteen manuscripts in all, and found the testimony of 'the Three in heaven' wanting but in seven; and therefore it was in the other eight; and so being found in the greater part of his manuscripts, has the authority and manuscripts on its side." Thus they argue; and this is the great argument by which the printed Greek has hitherto been justified.

XXVI. But if they please to consider the business a little better, they will find themselves very much mistaken. For though Stephens had fifteen manuscripts in all, yet all of them did not contain all the Greek testament. Four of them noted γ, ς, ιϵ, ιδ, had each of them the four gospels only Two noted ϵ, η, contained only the gospels, and the acts of the apostles. One, noted ις, contained the Apocalypse only. One, noted ιε, had only the Apocalypse, with St. Paul's epistles to the Corrinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. The other seven, noted δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, ια, ιγ, contained both St. Paul's epistles and the canonical ones, besides some other books; namely, the manuscript ζ contained the epistles and gospels; the manuscripts ι, ια, ιγ, the epistles and acts of the apostles; and the manuscripts δ, ε, θ, the epistles, gospels, and acts. And this any one may gather, by noting what manuscripts the various lections are cited out of, in every book of the New Testament. For in the various lections of the canonical epistles, and those to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews, are found these seven manuscripts, δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, ια, ιγ, every where cited, and no more than these. The same also, and no more, are cited in the epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews; one numeral error (whether of the scribe or typographer) excepted. Stephens

therefore did collect various lections of the epistles out of only these seven manuscripts, δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, ια, ιγ; and in all these seven he found the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" to be wanting; as you may see noted in the margin of his edition.

XXVII. And that this testimony was wanting in all Stephens's manuscripts, is apparent also by its being generally wanting in the manuscripts which are now extant in France. For father Simon[d] tells us, "That after a diligent search in the library of the king of France, and in that also of Monsieur Colbert, he could not find it in any one manuscript; though he consulted seven manuscripts in the king's library, and one in Colbert's." And because Stephens had some of his various lections from Italy, I will add, that a gentleman, who, in his travels, had consulted twelve MSS. in several libraries in Italy, assured me that he found it wanting in them all. One of the twelve was that most ancient and most famous MS. in the Pope's library, written in capital letters.

XXVIII. So then the authority of the printed books rests only upon the authority of the editions of Erasmus and Cardinal Ximenes. But seeing that Erasmus omitted it in his two first editions, and inserted it unwillingly, against the authority of his manuscripts, in his three last; the authority of these three can be none at all. When Lee, upon Erasmus's putting forth his second edition, fell foul upon him for leaving out the testimony of "the Three in heaven," Erasmus[e] answered, "That he had consulted more than seven Greek manu-

[d] Simon's critic. history of the New Test. chap. xviii.

[e] "Dicam mihi diversis temporibus plura fuisse exemplaria quam septem; [scilicet Græca] nec in ullo horum repertum, quod in nostris [scilicet Latinis] legitur. Quod si contigisset unum exemplar, in quo fuisset, quod nos legimus,

scripts, and found it wanting in them all; and that if he could have found it in any one manuscript, he would have followed that in favour of the Latin." Hence notice was sent to Erasmus out of England, that it was in a manuscript there, and thereupon to avoid[f] their calumnies (as he saith) he printed it in his following editions; notwithstanding that, he suspected that manuscript to be a new one, corrected by the Latin. But since, upon enquiry, I cannot learn that they in England ever heard of any such manuscript, but from Erasmus; and since he was only told of such a manuscript, in the time of the controversy between him and Lee, and never saw it himself, I cannot forbear to suspect, that it was nothing but a trick put upon him by some of the Popish clergy, to try if he would make good what he had offered, the printing of the testimony of "the Three in heaven" by the authority of one Greek copy, and thereby to get it into his edition.[g] Greek manuscripts of the scripture are things of value, and do not use to be thrown away; and such a manuscript, for the testimony of "the Three in heaven," would have made a greater noise than the rest have done against it. Let those who have such a manuscript, at length tell us where it is.

nimirum illinc adjecissem, quod in cæteris aberat. Id quia non contigit, quod solum licuit, feci; indicavi quid in Græcis codicibus minus esset."—*Hæc Erasmus contra Leum, in hunc locum.*

[f] "Ex hoc igitur codice Britannico reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse; ne cui sit ansa calumniandi. Quanquam et hunc suspicor, et Latinorum codices, fuisse castigatum. Posteaquam enim concordiam inierunt cum ecclesiæ Romana, studuerunt et hac in parte cum Romanis consentire." *Erasmi Annotation. in hunc locum; editio tertia, et sequen.*

[g] "Versiculus 1 Joan. v. 7, in Syriaca, ut et vetustissimis Græcis exemplaribus, nostro Alexandrino, aliis manuscriptis Græcis, quos contulimus, non reperitur."—*Walton Prolegomena*, xix. 23, *in Bibli. Polyglot.*

XXIX. So also let them, who insist upon the edition of cardinal Ximenes, tell us by what manuscript he printed this testimony; or, at least, where any such manuscript of good note is to be seen; for till then I must take the liberty to believe, that he printed nothing else than a translation out of the Latin, and that for these reasons,

First: Because in the preface to his edition of the New Testament we are told, that this testament was printed after the manuscripts taken out of the Pope's library; and these the cardinal only borrowed[h] thence, and therefore returned them back so soon as his edition was finished. And Caryophilus some time after, by the Pope's command, collating the Vatican manuscripts, found the testimony of "the Three in heaven" wanting in them all. I do not say but that the Cardinal had other manuscripts; but these were the chief, and the only ones he thought worth while to tell his reader of.

Secondly: I startle at the marginal note in this place of the Cardinal's edition. For it is beside the use of this edition, to put notes in the margin of the Greek text. I have not found it done above thrice in all this edition of the New Testament; and therefore there must be something extraordinary; and that, in respect of the Greek, because it is in the margin of this text. In 1 Corinth. xv. there is noted in this margin a notable variation in the Greek reading. In Matthew vi. 13, where they, in their edition, recede from the Greek copies, and correct it by the Latin, they make a marginal note, to justify their doing so; and so here, where the testimony of "the Three in heaven" is generally

[h] "Accivit è Vaticana Romæ Bibliotheca, bona cum Leonis X. pontificis maximi venia." As Gasper Bellerus, in his epistle prefixed to the Quinquagena of Antonius Nabrissensis, expresses it.

wanting in the Greek copies, they make a third marginal note, to secure themselves from being blamed for printing it. Now in such a case as this, there is no question but they would make the best defence they could; and yet they do not tell of any various lections in the Greek manuscripts, nor produce any one Greek manuscript on their side, but run to the authority of Thomas Aquinas.[1] The Greek manuscripts have the text thus, "For there are Three that bear record, the spirit, the water, and the blood; and these Three are One." In many of the Latin manuscripts, the words "these Three are One" are here omitted, and put only at the end of the testimony of "the Three in heaven," before that of "the spirit, water, and blood:" in others, they are put after both testimonies. In the Complutensian edition, they follow the former copies, and justify their doing so, by the authority of Thos. Aquinas.' "Thomas," say they, "in treating of the Three which bear witness in heaven, teaches, that the words 'these Three are One' are subjoined for insinuating the unity of the essence of the Three persons. And whereas one Joachim interpreted this

[1] The marginal note is this: "Sanctus Thomas, in expositione secundæ decretalis de summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, tractans istum passum contra Abbatem Joachim, viz. 'Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus," dicit ad literam verba sequentia. "Et ad insinuendam unitatem trium personarum subditur, et 'hi Tres Unum sunt;' quandoquidem dicitur propter essentiæ unitatem. Sed hoc Joachim perverse trahere volens ad unitatem charitatis et consensus, inducebat consequentem auctoritatem. Nam subditur ibidem, 'Et Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus sanctus, aqua, et sanguis:' et in quibusdam libris additur, 'et hi Tres Unum sunt.' Sed hoc in veris exemplaribus non habetur; sed dicitur esse appositum ab Hæreticis Arianis ad pervertendum intellectum sanum auctoritatis præmissæ de unitate essentiæ Trium Personarum." Hæc Beatus Thomas, ubi supra.

unity to be only in *love* and *consent*, it being thus said of the spirit, water, and blood, in some copies, 'these Three are One':" Thomas replied, "That this last clause is not extant in the true copies; but was added by the Arians for perverting the sense." Thus far this annotation. Now this plainly respects the Latin copies, (for Thomas understood not Greek) and therefore part of the design of this annotation is to set right the Latin reading. But this is not the main design. For so the annotation should have been set in the margin of the Latin version. Its being inserted in the margin of the Greek text shews, that its main design is to justify the Greek by the Latin thus rectified and confirmed. Now to make Thomas thus, in a few words, do all the work, was very artificial; and in Spain, where Thomas is of apostolic authority, might pass for a very judicious and substantial defence of the printed Greek. But to us, Thomas Aquinas is no Apostle. We are seeking for the authority of Greek manuscripts.

A third reason why I conceive the Complutensian Greek to have been in this place a translation from the Latin, is, because Stunica (who, as I told you, was one of the divines employed by the Cardinal in this edition, and at that very time wrote against Erasmus) when, in his objections, he comes to this text of the testimony of "the Three in heaven," he cites not one Greek manuscript for it against Erasmus; but argues wholly from the authority of the Latin. On the contrary, he sets down, by way of concession, the common reading of the Greek manuscripts (as well as his own, and that of others) in these words, "οτι τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες· το πνευμα, και το υδωρ, και το αιμα· και οι τρεις εις το εν εισι:" and then condemns them altogether without exception; and justifies the Latin against them by the authority of Jerome. "Know," saith he, "that in this place

the Greek manuscripts are most evidently corrupted; but ours (that is, the Latin ones) contain the truth itself, as they are translated from the first original: which is manifest by the prologue of St. Jerome upon the epistles, &c."[k] And this prologue (which he goes on to cite at length, and of which we gave you an account above) is all he argues in favour of the testimony of "the Three in heaven." In other places of scripture, where he had Greek manuscripts on his side, he produces them readily. So 1 Thessalonians ii. 7, "*Ita quidem legitur*," says he, "*in Græcis codicibus, quos ego viderim.*" In James i. 11, he saith, "*Sciendum in omnibus Græcis codicibus* πορειαις *hic legi per* ει *dipthongum.*" In 1 Thessalonians v. 23, he saith, "*Cum in Græcis exemplaribus quotquot sunt,* ολοκληρον, *et in Latinis* integer *hic legatur pernemine discrepante, nescio cur Erasmus dixerit, &c.*" In Philipp. iv. 9, "*Si quidem in omnibus,*" saith he, "*Græcis codicibus;* ταυτα λο ιζεσθε *hic legitur: neque Græci sunt libri, qui* πρασσετε *hoc loco, neque Latini, qui* agite; *n si mendosos utriusque linguæ coduces, cum hæc commentaretur Erasmus, perlegit.*" After this manner does Stunica produce the manuscripts used in the Complutensian edition, when they make for him: and here he produces them too, but it is for Erasmus against himself. "Know," saith he, "that in this place the Greek manuscripts are most evidently corrupted." In other places, if he hath but one manuscript on his side, he produces it magnificently enough; as the Codex Rhodiensis in

[k] "Sciendum est, hoc loco codices apertissime esse corruptos; nostros vero veritatem ipsam, ut à prima origine traducti sunt, continere; quod ex prologo B. Hieronymi super epistolas manifeste apparet." Ait enim, "Quæ si sicut ab eis digestæ sunt; ita quoque ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium, &c.—*Hæc Stunica in h. locum. Ejus Liber exstat in criticor. vol.* ix.

his discourses upon 2 Corinthians ii. 3, James i. 22, 2 Peter ii. 2, and other texts. Here he produces all the manuscripts against himself, without excepting so much as one. And hence Erasmus, in his answer to Stunica, gloried in the consent of the Spanish manuscripts with his own; and Sanctius Caranza, another of the Complutensian divines, in his defence of Stunica, written presently after, had nothing to reply in this point. Neither could Sepulveda, or the Spanish monks who next undertook the controversy, find one Greek manuscript, which here made against Erasmus. Neither had Marchio Valesius better success, though on that occasion he collated sixteen Greek manuscripts eight whereof belonged to the king of Spain's library, and the other eight to other libraries of Spain: and he did it on purpose to collect out of them whatever he could meet with in favour of the present vulgar Latin. Neither did the reprinting of the Complutensian Bible by Arias Montanus produce the notice of any such manuscript; though, on that occasion, many manuscripts, as well Greek as Latin, fetched from Complutum and other places, were collated by Arias, Lucas Brugensis, Canter, and others.

XXX. So then, to sum up the argument, the Complutensian divines did sometimes correct the Greek by the Latin, without the authority of any Greek manuscript, as appears by their practice in Matthew vi. 13, and therefore their printing the testimony of "the Three in heaven" is no evidence that they did it by a manuscript, but, on the contrary, for want of one, they contented themselves with the authority of Thomas Aquinas: and Stunica confessed that they had none. Nor has all the zeal for this text been able since to discover one either in Spain, or any where else.

XXXI. And now you may understand whence it is, that the Complutensian edition, and the reading of the pretended English manuscript, set down by Erasmus in his annotations, differ so much from one another; for the Complutensian edition has the text thus: "Οτι τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τω ουρανω, ὁ πατηρ, ὁ λογος, και το αγιον πνευμα· και οι τρεις εις το εν εισι· και τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες επι της γης, το πνευμα, και το υδωρ, και το αιμα." The pretended English manuscript thus: "Οτι τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τω ουρανω, πατηρ, λογος, και πνευμα· και ουτοι οι τρεις εν εἰσιν· και τρεις μαρτυρουντες εν τη γη, πνευμα, και υδωρ, και αιμα." The differences are too great to spring from the bare errors of scribes, and arise rather from the various translations of the place, out of Latin into Greek, by two several persons.

XXXII. But whilst these two readings, by their discord, confute one another, the readings of the real Greek manuscripts by their agreement confirm one another as much. For Caryophilus, who, by the command of Pope Urban the Eighth, collated the Vatican and other manuscripts, borrowed out of the principal libraries in Rome, found one common reading in them all, without the testimony of "the Three in heaven;" as you may see in those his collations, printed in 1673 by Peter Possinus, in the end of his Catena of the Greek fathers upon Mark. He met with eight manuscripts in all upon the epistles, and notes their reading thus: "1 Joan. v. 7, Manuscripti octo (omnes nempe) legunt, Οτι τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες, το πνευμα, και το υδωρ, και το αιμα; και οι τρεις εις το εν εισι." "*Porro totus septimus versus hujus capitis desideratur in octo manuscriptis codicibus Græcis, &c.*" Thus Caryophilus.

XXXIII. The very same reading Erasmus, in his annotations on this place, gives us of all his manuscripts, which were more than seven; and so

doth Stephens of all his seven, without noting any various lections in them. Only the comma, which in Stephens's edition is (surely by mistake) set after ϰεανω, is to be put in its right place. The very same reading does Stunica also, in his book against Erasmus, note out of the manuscript he had seen in Spain, as was seen above. Nor does Valesius, in his collection of the sixteen Spanish manuscripts, note any various lections in this text. The same reading exactly have also the manuscripts in England; namely, that most ancient and famous one in the king's library, which was conveyed thither from Egypt through Greece, and published in Walton's Polyglott Bible; and the four at Oxford, viz that in New College, and that in Magdalen College, (both very old,) and two in Lincoln College: and four or five other ancient ones lately collated at Oxford, in order to a new impression of the Greek testament, as I am informed. The very same reading have also the three manuscripts of Monsieur Petavius Gachon, a senator of Paris, whose various lections, collected by his son John Gachon, were printed in the Oxford edition of the New Testament, anno Christi 1675. The same reading, without any variation, is published by Francis Asulan in his edition, printed anno Christi 1518, by Aldus at Venice, out of the manuscripts of those parts. The same reading Oecumenius, six hundred years ago, found in the manuscripts of Greece; as you may see in the text of his commentary on this epistle of St. John. The same reading also Cyril of Alexandria met with in the manuscripts of Egypt, above eleven hundred years ago; as you may see in his citations of the text; both in his Thesaurus, lib. xiv. cap. v.; and in his first book *De Fide ad Reginas;* excepting that in the latter of these two citations, the particle "εις" is omitted; and

"μαρτυρουσι" written for "οι μαρτυρουντες." And that the very same reading was also in the manuscripts of the first ages, may be gathered from the conformity of this reading to all the ancient versions.

XXXIV. It may seem by what has been hitherto said, that this testimony is not to be found in the Greek manuscripts. Epanorthotes,[l] whom Lucas Brugensis describes to be an ancient, accurate, full, and industrious collator of manuscripts, found it wanting in all those he met with. "*Epanorthotes,*" saith Lucas, "*deese hæc eadem Græcis libris, et antiquis Latinis annotat.*" Nor have other collators made a further discovery to this day. Lee, Stunica, and the rest of England, Spain, Flanders, France, and Italy, who conspired against Erasmus, could find nothing in the manuscripts of those parts against him; if that Phœnix be excepted, which once appeared to somebody somewhere in England, but could never since be seen. Hesselius,[m] about

[l] "Habuimus ab Hunnæo——id quod maximi facimus, MS. Bibl. correctorium ab incerto auctore, quem Epanorthotem, aut correctorem fere vocamus, magna diligentia, ac fide contextum, secuto uti oportet antiquos nostræ editionis codices, eosque cum Hæbræis, Græcis, et veterum patrum commentariis sedulo collatos: qui liber ad Genesin viii. 7: latius a nobis descriptus est." Hæc Lucas; qui ad Genesin viii. 7, dixit hunc librum multis annis scriptum, et pluribus forte compositum. Dein loco ex eo citato pergit. "Ad quæ dici quid possit? An quod libro fidendum non sit? Non hoc dicet, qui evolverit; quæ namque á nostri seculi scriptoribus ex MSS. codicibus collectæ sunt variæ lectiones, omnes propemodum in eo comperimus; et ad fontes fideliter examinatas deprehendimus.——*Scripsit hæc Lucas*, anno 1579: unde sequitur correctorium ante disputationes Erasmicas de testibus in cœlo elaboratum esse."

[m] Hesselius in hunc locum ait: "Manuscripti Græci fere omnes sic se habent. 'Quoniam Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et hi Tres Unum sunt;' nulla facta mentione triplicis testimonii de cœlo. 'Patris,

the year 1565, professor of divinity at Lovain, in his commentary on this place, ingenuously confesses it wanting in all the Greek manuscripts then known, except two; the one in Spain, the other in England; meaning those by which the Complutensian divines and Erasmus printed it. Which two we have shewn to be none at all; unless one Annius dug up one in England. Since that time nothing further has been produced, besides the imaginary books of dreaming Beza. And yet I will not say, but that it may hereafter be found in some Greek copies. For in the times of the holy war, the Latines had much to do in the East. They were long united to the Greek church: they made Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch: they reigned at Constantinople over the Greeks from the year 1204, for above fifty years together: and during this their kingdom, in the year 1215, was assembled the Lateran council, consisting of four hundred and fifteen bishops, Greeks and Latins together; and therein the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was quoted out of some of the Latin manuscripts, as we told you above. All which might occasion some Greeks, as well as Latins, to note it in the margins of their books; and hence insert it into the text in transcribing. For this is most certain, that some Greek manuscripts have been corrected by the Latin ones. Such a book Erasmus[n] tells us,

Verbi, et Spiritus Sancti." Dein codices aliter legentes describendo sic pergit: "Nostro tempore duo Græci codices manuscripti reperti sunt; unus in Anglia, et alter in Hispania: quorum uterque hoc loco testimonium habet 'Patris, Verbi, et Spiritus Sancti'."

[n] "Hic obiter illud incidit admonendum esse Græcorum quosdam Novi Testamenti codices ad Latina exemplaria emendatos. Id factum est in fœdere Græcorum cum Romana ecclesia: quod fœdus testatur Bulla, quæ dicitur Aurea: visum est enim et hoc ad firmandam concordiam pertinere.

that he "once met with, and that there was such another in "the Pope's library." He suspected also that book in England, out of which he printed the testimony of "the Three in heaven," to be of the same kind; though I rather think it was none at all; unless some falsary of that age were at the pains to transcribe one or two of St. Paul's epistles. Such another book was one of those, out of which Valesius collected his various lections. Whence Mariana, into whose hands the manuscript book of those lections fell, tells us, that for that reason, in his annotations on the New Testament, he used those lections but sparingly and cautiously. And that Valesius did meet with such a corrected manuscript, appears by the lections themselves. For in the Apocalypse xviii. 17, where the Greek reads "επι τοπον;" and the Latin translates *in locum*, and by the error of one letter *in lacum*, as the books now have it; some Grecian has here corrected this book by the Latin, and written "επι λιμνην;" as it is in the lections of Valesius, taken out of this. Again in the Apocalypse ix. 11, where the Latin translation, in expounding the names *Abaddon et Apollyon*, adds, "*Et Latine habens nomen exterminans;*" Valesius notes the reading in his Greek copy to be "ϛωμαιϛι εχων ονομα εξτεϛμινανς;" which certainly is a translation of the Latin. Again, in the Apocalypse xxi. 12, where the Greek has "αγϛελους;" and some ancient Latin copies, *angelos*; but the far greater part of the Latin copies at present have *angulos;* Velesius, in his manuscript, reads "γωνιας." So in the Apocalypse xix. 6, where the Greek is "οχλου πολλου;" the Latin, *turbæ magnæ;* and in the later

Et nos olim in hujusmodi codicem indicimus; et talis adhuc dicitur adservari in Bibliotheca Pontif. Verum ex his corrigere nostros est Lesbiam, ut aiunt, admovere regulam."—*Erasmus ad Lectorem. Editio 5ta Novi Testamenti.*

copies, *tubæ magnæ;* Valesius, in his manuscript, reads "σαλπιγγος μεγαλης." In Hebrews xiii. 2, for "ελαθον," *latuerunt;* and in later copies, *placuerunt*, Valesius reads "ηρεσαν:" and in 1 Peter iii. 8, for "το οε τελος," *in fine*, and by an error *in fide*, Valesius reads "εν τη πιςει δε." These, and such like instances, put the thing out of dispute. Now, though Valesius found not the testimony of "the Three in heaven" in this manuscript; and Erasmus tells us, that he never saw it in any Greek manuscript; and, by consequence, not in that corrected one which fell into his hands, yet it may have crept out of the Latin into some other books, not yet taken notice of; and even in some manuscripts, which, in other places, have not been corrected by the Latin, it may possibly have been inserted by some of the Greek bishops of the Lateran council, where the testimony of "the Three in heaven" was read. And therefore he, that shall hereafter meet with it in any book, ought first, before he insist upon the authority of that book, to examine whether it has not been corrected by the Latin; and whether it be ancienter than the Lateran council, and empire of the Latins in Greece; for, if it be liable to either of these two exceptions, it can signify nothing to produce it.

XXXV. Having given you the history of the controversy, I shall now confirm all that I have said from the sense of the text itself. For, without the testimony of "the Three in heaven," the sense is good and easy, as you may see by the following paraphrase inserted in the text in a different character.

"WHO IS HE THAT OVERCOMETH THE WORLD, BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH THAT JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD, that Son spoken of in the Psalms, where he saith, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.' 'THIS IS HE THAT, after the Jews had long expected him,

CAME, first in a mortal body, BY baptism of WATER, AND then in an immortal one by shedding his BLOOD upon the cross, and rising again from the dead; NOT BY WATER ONLY, BUT BY WATER AND BLOOD; being the Son of God, as well by his resurrection from the dead (Acts xiii. 33) as by his supernatural birth of the Virgin (Luke i. 35.) AND IT IS THE SPIRIT also, THAT, together with the water and blood, BEARETH WITNESS of the truth of his coming; BECAUSE THE SPIRIT IS TRUTH; and so a fit and unexceptionable witness. FOR THERE ARE THREE THAT BEAR RECORD of his coming; THE SPIRIT, which he promised to send; and which was since shed forth upon us in the form of cloven tongues, and in various gifts; THE baptism of WATER, wherein God testified, 'This is my beloved Son; AND THE shedding of his BLOOD, accompanied with his resurrection, whereby he became the most faithful martyr, or witness of this truth. AND THESE THREE, the spirit, the baptism, and passion of Christ, AGREE IN witnessing ONE, and the same thing (namely, that the Son of God is come;) and, therefore, their evidence is strong: for the law requires but two consenting witnesses, and here we have three: AND IF WE RECEIVE THE WITNESS OF MEN, THE threefold WITNESS OF GOD, which he bare of his Son, by declaring at his baptism, 'This is my beloved Son;' by raising him from the dead, and by pouring out his spirit on us, IS GREATER; and therefore ought to be more readily received.

XXXII. This is the sense plain and natural, and the argument full and strong: but, if you insert the testimony of "the Three in heaven," you interrupt and spoil it. For the whole design of the apostle being here to prove to men by witness the truth of

Christ's coming, I would ask how the testimony of "the Three in heaven" makes to this purpose. If their testimony be not given to men, how does it prove to them the truth of Christ's coming? If it be, how is the testimony in heaven distinguished from that on earth? It is the same spirit which witnesses in heaven and in earth. If in both cases it witnesses to us men, wherein lies the difference between its witnessing in heaven, and its witnessing in earth? If, in the first case, it does not wtiness to men, to whom doth it witness? And to what purpose? And how does its witnessing make to the design of St. John's discourse? Let them make good sense of it, who are able. For my part, I can make none. If it be said that we are not to determine what is scripture, and what not, by our private judgments; I confess it in places not controverted: but in disputable places, I love to take up with what I can best understand. It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind, in matters of religion, ever to be fond of mysteries; and for that reason, to like best what they understand least. Such men may use the apostle John as they please; but I have that honour for him, as to believe that he wrote good sense; and therefore take that sense to be *his*, which is the best: especially since I am defended in it by so great authority. For I have on my side the authority of the Fourth General Council, and (so far as I know) of all the churches in all ages, except the modern Latin, and such others as have lately been influenced by them; and that also of all the old versions, and Greek manuscripts, and ancient Latin ones: and nothing against me, but the authority of Jerome, and the credulity and heat of his followers. For to tell us of other manuscripts, without ever letting us know in what libraries they were to be seen: to

pretend manuscripts which, since their first discovery, could never be heard of; nor were then seen by persons whose names and credit we know; is plainly to impose upon the learned world, and ought not to pass any longer for plain dealing. The Spaniards tell us plainly that they followed the Latin, and by the authority of Thomas left out the clause, "And these Three are One," in the eighth verse, as inserted by the Arians. And yet St. Ambrose, St Austin, Eucherius, and other Latins, in the Arian age, gathered the unity of the DEITY from this clause; and the omission of it is now, by printing it, acknowledged to be an erroneous correction. The manuscript in England wanted the same clause, and therefore if there was any such MS. it was a corrected one, like the Spanish edition, and the manuscript of Valesius. Erasmus, who printed the triple testimony in heaven by that English manuscript, never saw it; tells us it was a new one; suspected its sincerity; and accused it publicly in his writings on several occasions, for several years together: and yet his adversaries in England never answered his accusation; never endeavoured to satisfy him, and the world about it; did not so much as let us know, where the record might be consulted for confuting him; but, on the contrary, when they had got the Trinity into his edition, threw by their manuscript (if they had one) as an almanack out of date. And can such shuffling dealings satisfy considering men? Let manuscripts at length be produced, and freely exposed to the sight of the learned world; but let such manuscripts be produced as are of authority; or else let it be confessed, that whilst Jerome pretended to correct the Latin by the Greek, the Latins have corrected both the Latin and the Greek by the sole authority of Jerome.

I. WHAT the Latins have done to the foregoing, the Greeks have done to that of St. Paul (Timothy iii. 16.) For by changing ὁ into ΘC, the abbreviation of Θεος, they now read, "Great is the mystery of godliness: GOD manifested in the flesh." Whereas all the churches for the first four or five hundred years, and the authors of all the ancient versions, Jerome, as well as the rest, read, "Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh." For this is the common reading of the Ethiopic, Syriac, and Latin versions to this day; Jerome's manuscripts having given him no occasion to correct the old vulgar Latin in this place. Grotius adds the Arabic, but the Egyptian Arabic version has Θεος; and so has the above-mentioned Sclavonian version of Cyrillus: for these two versions were made long after the sixth century, wherein the corruption began. With the ancienter versions agree the writers of the first five centuries, both Greeks and Latins. For they, in all their discourses to prove the Deity of the Son, never alledge this text (that I can find) as they would all have done; (and some of them frequently) had they read "God manifested in the flesh," and therefore they read ὁ. Tertullian *(adversus Praxeam)* and Cyprian *(adversus Judæos)* industriously cite all the places where Christ is called God, but have nothing of this. Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, the bishops of the council of Sardica, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Cassian, also Hilary, Lucifer, Jerome, Ambrose, Austin, Phæbadius, Victorinus Afer, Faustinus Diaconus, Pope Leo the Great, Arnobius junior,

Cerealis, Vigilius Tapsensis, Fulgentius, wrote all of them, in the fourth and fifth centuries, for the Deity of the Son, and incarnation of God; and some of them largely, and in several tracts; and yet I cannot find that they ever alledge this text to prove it, excepting that Gregory Nyssen once urges it, if the passage crept not into him out of some marginal annotation In all the times of the hot and lasting Arian controversy, it never came into play; though now those disputes are over, they that read "God manifested in the flesh," think it one of the most obvious and pertinent texts for the business.

II. The churches therefore of those ages were absolute strangers to this reading For, on the contrary, their writers, as often as they have any occasion to cite the reading then in use, discover that it was ὁ. For though they cite it not to prove the Deity of the Son, yet in their commentaries, and sometimes in other discourses, they produce it. And particularly Hilary (lib. 2. *de Trinitate)* and Ambrose, or whoever of his contemporaries was the author of the commentary on the epistles, reads ὁ; and so doth St. Austin *in Genesin ad literam,* lib. 5; and Beda in his commentary on this text, where he cites the reading of St. Austin, and the author of the commentary on the epistles ascribed to Jerome. So also do Primasius and Sedulius in their commentaries on this text; and Victorinus Afer, lib. 1. *adversus Arium*; and Idacius Clarus, or rather Vigilius Tapsensis, lib. 3, *adversus Varimadum*, cap. 12; and Fulgentius, c. 2, *de Incarnatione;* and so did Pope Leo the Great, epist. 20, *ad Flavianum;* and Pope Gregory the Great, *lib.* 34, *Moral. cap.* 7. These ancient Latins all cite the text after this manner, "Great is the mystery of Godliness, which was manifested in the

° Orat. xi. contra Eunom.

flesh;" as the Latin manuscripts of St. Paul's epistles generally have it to this day: and therefore it cannot be doubted, but that this hath been the constant public reading of the Latin churches from the beginning. So also one of the Arians in a homily, printed in Fulgentius's works, reads ὁ, and interprets it of the Son of God, who was born of the Father *ante secula;* and of the Virgin, *in novissimo tempore.* And fulgentius, in his answer to this homily, found no fault with the citation; but on the contrary, in his first book *ad Trasimundum, cap.* 6, seems to have read and understood the text after the same manner with other Latins.

III. Now for the Greeks: I find indeed that they have changed the ancient reading of the text, not only in the manuscripts of St. Paul's epistles, but also in other authors; and yet there are still remaining sufficient instances among them of what the reading was at first. So in Chrysostom's commentary on this epistle, they have now gotten Θεος into the text; and yet by considering the commentary itself, I am satisfied that he read ὁ. For he neither in this commentary, nor any where else, infers the Deity of Christ from this text; nor expounds it, as they do who read Θεος;[p] but with the

[p] *Nor expounds it as they do, who read* Θεος.] They who read Θεος cannot expound the passage otherwise than Chrysostom expounds it. His words, "For God was made Man, and Man God," are not particularly expositive of ὁ, as our author imagines, but declarative of the mystery which the apostle calls the great mystery of godliness, and they will not decide for either reading. "Observe," says Chrysostom, "how the apostle calls the dispensation for our sakes [the scheme of redemption] a mystery in all its branches. With good reason. For it is not known to all men. Nay, rather it was [formerly] not known to angels. How should it? since it has been discovered through the church. Therefore, he says, without controversy it is great. And great indeed it is. For God has been made Man, and Man God.

Latins, who read ὁ, understands by it Christ incarnate; or, as he expresses it, "Man made God, and God made Man;" and so leaves it at liberty to be taken for either God or man. And accordingly in one place of his commentary he saith, "Εφανερωθη εν σαρκι ὁ δημιουργος."[q] In another place: "Ανθρωπος ωφθη αναμαρτητος, ανθρωπος ανελημφθη, εκηρυχθη εν κοσμω, μεθ' ημων ειδον αυτον οι αγγελοι." "Man appeared without sin; Man was received up; Man was preached in the world; was seen amongst us by angels." Instead of "ὁ εφανερωθη εν σαρκι, εδικαιωθη εν πνευματι," &c. he saith, "Man appeared without sin;" making Man the nominative case to these, and all the verbs which follow; which certainly he would not have done, had θεος been their nominative case expressly in the text. He might properly put man for ὁ, but not for θεος. Neither could he have put αναμαρτητος for εδικαιωθη; if he had read in his text θεος εδικαιωθη. For what man of common sense would say, that God was made sinless in and through the spirit? But what I have said of Chrysostom will be more evident, when I shall have shewn you how after-

A Man was seen without sin. A Man has been received up—preached in the world—angels saw him with us—truly this is mystery." The design of this paraphrase of St. Chrysostom's is to shew that the scheme of redemption involves mystery in every distinct branch mentioned by the apostle: and our author's conclusion, that the subject of the verb εφανερωθη, in Chrysostom's bible, was something that might be taken either for God or man, is at best precarious. The more natural conclusion would be, that the common subject of the verbs εφανερωθη, εδικαιωθη, ωφθη, εκηρυχθη, &c. was some word that might denote a living person; and is not likely to have been the neuter relative ὁ.

[q] Chrysostom's words are——λεγων, "Θεος εφανερωθη εν σαρκι," τουτεστιν, ὁ δημιουργος. Substitute ὁ for Θεος in the text of Chrysostom, and the exposition τουτ' εστιν ὁ δημιουργος, will be rank nonsense.

wards, in the time of the Nestorian controversy, all parties read ὁ or ὅς without any dispute raised about the reading; and how the Greeks have since corrupted the text in Cyril's writings, and changed ὁ and ὅς into θεὸς, as they have done in Chrysostom's.

IV. And, first, that the Nestorians read ὁ is evident by some fragments of the orations or homilies of Nestorius sent by him to the Pope, and cited by Arnobius Junior, in the second book of his conflict with Serapion. For there, in order to shew what was the opinion of Nestorius, and how he defended it, he cites two of his orations in these words: "*Non peperit sanctissima Maria Deitatem; nam quod natum est de carne, caro est. Non peperit creatura Creatorem; sed peperit hominem Deitatis ministrum. Non ædificavit Deum verbum, Spiritus Sanctus; quod ex ipsa natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est. Deo itaque virgo templum ex virgine ædificavit.*" *Et paulo post,* "*Qui per se natus est Deus in utero (scilicet ante Luciphorum) Deus est.*" *Et paulo post;* Θεοτόκε *formam in Deo honoramus.*" *Et in alia prædicatione; Spiritum divina separat natura, qui humanitatem ejus creavit. Quicquid ex Maria natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est, qui et secundum justitiam replevit, quod creatum est; hoc quod manifestum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu*" Which last words in the language wherein Nestorius wrote those homilies, are, ὁ εφανερωθη ε σαρκι, εδικαιωθη εν πνευματι."

V. Here you see that Nestorius reads ὁ expressly; not only so, but absolutely excludes God from being understood by it; arguing, that the Virgin was not θεοτοκος, because that thing which was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit; or (as he expounds it) replenished by the spirit in righteousness, and calling that thing which was

manifested in the flesh, a creature: "*Spiritus,*" saith he, "*secundum justitiam replevit* [*hoc*] *quod creatum est;* [*nempe*] *hoc quod manifestum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu.*"

VI. And now whilst he read the text after this manner, and urged it thus against the Deity of Christ, one would suspect, that if this had not been the received public reading in the Greek churches, his adversaries would have fallen foul upon him, and exclaimed against him for falsifying the text, and blasphemously saying it was a created thing, which the scripture calls "God manifested in the flesh." And such an accusation as this would surely have made as great a noise as any thing else in the controversy: and yet I meet with nothing of this kind in history. His adversaries do not so much as tell him, that θεος was in the text. They were so far from raising any controversy about the reading, that they do not in the least correct him for it; but on the contrary they themselves, in their answers to his writings, read ὁ, as he did; and only laboured by various disputations to put another sense upon the text, as I find by Cassian and Cyril, the two principal who at that time wrote against him.

VII. John Cassian was Chrysostom's scholar, and his deacon and legate to the Pope; and after the banishment of Chrysostom, retired from Constantinople into Syria and Egypt, where he lived a monkish life for some time, and then ended his days in France. At that time, therefore, when Nestorius, who was patriarch of Constantinople, broached his opinion, and Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, opposed him; Nestorius sent a legacy to Rome with copies of his orations, to let the Pope understand the controversy: and thereupon Leo the Great, who was then archdeacon of the Church of Rome, and afterwards pope, put Cassian (then in

France) upon writing this book, *De Incarnatione Domini*, against Nestorius. He wrote it therefore in the year 430, as Baronius also reckons. For he wrote it before the condemnation of Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, as appears by the book itself. This book is now extant only in Latin; but, considering that his design in writing was to stir up the Greek church against Nestorius, and that for the making great impression upon them, he quotes Greek fathers at the end of his book, and concludes with an exhortation to the citizens of Constantinople, telling them, that what he wrote for, he had received from his master Chrysostom: I am satisfied that he wrote it originally in Greek. His other books were in both languages. For Photius saw them in eoquent Greek; and it is more likely that they had their author's eloquent language from their author, and the Latin from one of the Latins where he lived; than that the contrary should be true. Now in this treatise when he comes to consider the passage of Nestorius about this text, of which we gave you an account above out of Arnobius, he returns this answer to it: "*Jam primum enim hoc ais Nestori, quia justitia repleverit, quod creatum est; et hoc apostolico vis testimonio comprobare, quod dicat,* apparuit in carne; justificatus est in Spiritu; *utrumque falso sensu, et furioso Spiritu loqueris. Quia et hoc, quod a Spiritu vis eum repletum esse justitia, ideo ponis, ut ostendas ejus vacuitatem, cui præstitam esse asseras justitiæ adimpletionem. Et hoc, quod super hac re apostolico testimonio uteris, divini testimonii ordinem rationemque furaris. Non enim ita ab apostolo positum est, ut tu id truncatum, vitiatumque posuisti. Quid enim apostolus ait?* 'Et manifeste magnum est pietatis sacramen-

[1] Libro septimo, cap. 18.

tum, quod manifestum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu.' *Vides ergo, quod mysterium pietatis, vel sacramentum justificatum apostolus prædicavit.*" Thus far Cassian not only reading ὁ, but confuting Nestorius by that reading. For whereas Nestorius said it was a creature which was justified, Cassian tells him, that if he had read the whole text, he would have found that it was "the mystery of godliness." "*Vides ergo,*" saith he, "*quod mysterium pietatis justificatum apostolus prædicavit.*" He does not say "*Deum justificatum apostolus prædicavit;*" (as he would certainly have done, had that been in his bible) but *mysterium;* and so makes *mysterium*, or, which is all one, its relative *quod*, the nominative case to the verbs which follow. In another part of this treatise, lib. 5, cap. 12, Cassian cites and interprets the text as follows: "*Et manifeste magnum est pietatis sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne, &c. Quod ergo magnum est illud sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne? Deus, scilicet, natus in carne, Deus visus in corpore, qui utique sicut palam est assumptus in gloria.*" So you see Nestorius and Cassian agree in reading ὁ, but differ in interpreting it; the one restraining it to a creature, by reason of its being justified; the other restraining it to God, by reason of its being a great mystery, and assumed in glory.

VIII. In like manner Cyril, the grand adversary of Nestorius, in his three books, *De Fide ad Imperatorem et Reginas*, written against him in the beginning of that controversy, did not reprehend him, as if he had cited the text falsely, but only complained of his misinterpreting it; telling him, that he did not understand the great mystery of godliness, and that it was not a created thing, (as he thought) but the Word or Son of God; and arguing for this interpretation from the circum-

stances of the text. And, first, in his book *De Fide ad Imperatorem*, sect. 7, he has this passage: Πλανασθε, μη ειδοτες τας γραφας· μητε μεν το μεγα της ευσεβειας μυστηριον, τουτεστι Χριστον, ὁς εφανερωθη εν σαρκι, εδικαιωθη εν πνευματι, &c." "Ye err," saith he, "not knowing the scriptures, nor the great mystery of godliness, that is Christ; who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit." By this citation it is plain that he read ὁς, using one of these MSS. which, by understanding Χριστον for μυστηριον, turned ὁ into ὁς; and, by way of interpretation, inserting τουτεστι Χριστον, which in those MSS. was to be understood; unless you will say that he turns Θεος into ὁς, which is very hard. For had Θεος been in this text he would not have said μυστηριον, τουτεστι Χριστον, ὁς εφανερωθη; but μυστηριον, Θεος, τουτεστι Χριστος εφανερωθη, putting Χριστος not for μυστηριον, but for Θεος. For Χριστος and Θεος are more plainly equipollent than Χριστος and μυστηριον. And making Χριστος and μυστηριον equipollent, he makes μυστηριον the nominative case to εφανερωθη: and therefore read them joined in this text by the article ὁς· Had he read Θεος, he would never have left out that authentic and demonstrative word, and by way of interpretation for μυστηριον Θεος, written Χριστον ὁς. For this was not to argue against Nestorius, but to spoil the argument which lay before him. Neither would he have gone on, as he does, within a few lines, to recite the same text, putting λογος by way of interpretation for μυστηριον; and after to propound it as his bare opinion, that the Word or Son of God was here to be understood by this mystery, and to dispute for this his opinion, as needing proof out of other texts of scripture, as he does after this manner:[s] "Moreover," saith he, "in

[s] "Ειη γαρ αν ουχ' ετερον οιμαι τι το της ευσεβειας μυστηριον, η αυτος ἡμιν ὁ εκ θεου πατρος λογος, ὁς εφανερωθη εν σαρκι. Γεγενηται γαρ δια της αγιας παρθενου και θεοτοκου, μορφην δουλου λαβων." —*Cyril de Fide ad Imperatorem*, sect 8.

my opinion, that mystery of godliness is nothing else than he who came to us from God the Father; the Word, who was manifested in the flesh. For in taking the form of a servant, he was born of the holy God-bearing Virgin, &c." And then after many other things he at length, in sect. 23 and 24, concludes, that "this divine mystery is above our understanding; and that the only-begotten, who is God, and, according to the scriptures, the Lord of all things, appeared to us, was seen on earth, and became a man." This he makes not the text itself, but the interpretation thereof; and from the preceding disputation, concludes it to be genuine.

IX. Again, in the first of his two treatises, *De Fide ad Reginas*, near the end, he cites the text, and argues thus against the interpretation of Nestorius. "Who is he," saith he, "that is manifested in the flesh? Is it not fully evident, that it is no other than the word of God the Father? For so will that be a great mystery of godliness (which was[t] manifested in the flesh:) he was seen of angels, ascending into heaven; he was preached to the Gentiles by the holy apostles; he was believed on in the world; but this not as a mere man; but as God born in the flesh, and after our manner."

X. So also in his second book, *De Fide ad Reginas*,[u] he cites the place again; and then argues upon it against the opinion of Nestorius after this manner: "If the word, being God, is said to become a Man, and yet continue what he was before, without losing his Deity, the mystery of godliness is without doubt a very great one: but if Christ be a mere man, joined with God only in the parity of dignity and power (for this is maintained by some unlearned men) how is he manifested in the flesh?

[t] Codex Græcus hoc loco jam legit ΘC pro ὃς sensu perturbato.

[u] Section 33.

Is it not plain, that every man is in the flesh, and cannot otherwise be seen by any body; how then was he said to be seen of the holy angels? For do they not also see us? What was there therefore new or extraordinary in Christ, if the angels saw him such a Man as we are, and nothing more, &c." Thus Cyril goes on to give his reasons why that, which was manifested in the flesh, was not a mere created Man, as Nestorius interpreted, but the eternal Word, or Son of God; all which would have been very superfluous and impertinent, if God had then been expressly in the text.

XI. Seeing therefore Nestorius alledged the text to prove, that it was a created thing which was manifested in the flesh; and Cyril, in confuting him, did not answer that it was God expressly in the text, nor raise any debate about the reading, but only put another interpretation upon the text than Nestorius had done; arguing with Cassian, that in the text it was not a mere Man, as Nestorius contended, but a great mystery of godliness; and by consequence Christ, or God the Son, which was manifested in the flesh; and labouring by divers other arguments to prove this interpretation, it is evident beyond all cavil, that Cyril was a stranger to Θεος, now got into the text; and read ὅς or ὁ, as Nestorius and Cassian did.

XII. And all this is further confirmed by Photius, who, in his commentary on the epistles not yet published, relates that Cyril, in the 12th chapter of his Scholiums, read ὅς εφανερωθη, &c. and consonant to this reading is Cyril's commentary upon the text in his explanation of the second of the twelve Anathematisms, where he puts the question, "*Quid est igitur quod dicit, apparuit in carne?*" And explains it by saying, "*Hoc est Dei patris verbum caro factum est:*" and concludes, that it is hence

that we call him God and Man. Whereas had Θεος been in the text, it would have needed no interpretation; nor would he have put λογος for Θεος, in order to prove that God was manifested in the flesh. And yet in his books *ad Reginas*, and his other writings, wherever he quotes this text, the Greeks have since corrected it by their corrected manuscripts of St. Paul's epistles, and written Θεος instead of ὁ: whence, if you would truly understand the Nestorian history, you must read ὁ or ὅς for Θεος in all Cyril's citations of this text.

XIII. Now, whilst Cyril read ὁ or ὅς, and in the explanation of the twelve chapters, or articles, quoted this text in the second article; and this explanation was recited by him in the council of Ephesus, and approved by the council,[w] with an anathema at the end of every article: it is manifest that this council allowed the reading ὅς or ὁ; and by consequence that ὅς or ὁ was the authentic public uncontroverted reading till after the times of this council. For if Nestorius and Cyril, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, and the heads of the two parties in this controversy, read ὅς or ὁ; and their writings went about amongst the eastern churches, and were canvassed by the bishops and clergy without any dispute raised about the reading; and if Cyril read ὅς by the approbation of the council itself: I think that the conclusion we make, of its being then the general uncontroverted reading, must needs be granted us. And if the authority of one of the first four general councils make any thing for the truth of the reading, we have that into the bargain.

XIV. Yet whilst the Nestorian controversy brought the text into play, and the two parties ran

[w] Concil. Ephes. par. iii. sub initio.

the interpretation into extremes, the one disputing that ὁ or ὅς was a creature; the other, that it was the word of God: the prevalence of the latter party made it pass for the orthodox opinion, that ὁ or ὅς was God; and so gave occasion to the Greeks henceforward to change the language of Christ into that of God; and say, in their expositions of the text, that God was manifested in the flesh, (as I find Theodoret doth,) and at length to write God in the text itself; the easy change of O or OC into ΘC, inviting them to do it: and, if this was become the orthodox authentic reading, to set right the text in Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, and wherever else they found it (in their opinion) corrupted by hereticks.

XV. And the man that first began thus to alter the sacred text, was Macedonius, the patriarch of Constantinople, in the beginning of the sixth century. For the Emperor Anastasius banished him for corrupting it. At that time, the Greek church had been long divided about the council of Chalcedon. Many, who allowed the condemnation of Eutyches, rejected the council; by reason of its decreeing, by the influence of the bishop of Rome's letter against Eutyches, that Christ subsisted not only *ex duabus naturis*, which Eutyches allowed, but also *in duabus naturis*; which language was new to the Greeks, and by a great part of that church taken for Nestorianism. For they understood, that as the body and soul made the nature of man, so God and man made the nature of Christ; assigning the nature to the person of Christ, as well as to all other things, and not considering that in all compounds the several parts have also their several natures. Hence each party endeavoured to render the other suspected of heresy; as if they that were for the council secretly favoured the Nestori-

ans, and they that were against it, the Eutychians. For one part, in maintaining two distinct natures in Christ, were thought to deny the nature of one person with Nestorius; and the other party, in opposing two distinct natures in him, were thought to deny the truth of one of the natures with Eutyches. Both parties, therefore, to clear themselves of those imputations, anathematised both those heresies; and therefore whilst they thus differed in their modes of speaking, they agreed in their sense, as Evagrius well observes. But the bishops of Rome and Alexandria being engaged against one another, and for a long time distracting the east by these disputes; at length the Emperor Zeno, to quiet his empire, and perhaps to secure it from the encroachment of the bishop of Rome, who, by this verbal contest,[x] aspired to the name and authority of universal bishop, sent about an *henoticum*, or pacificatory decree; wherein he anathematised both Nestorius and Eutyches with their followers on one hand, and abrogated the Pope's letter and the council on the other: and his successor, Anastasius, for the same end, laboured to have this degree signed by all the bishops. And Macedonius at first subscribed it; but afterwards heading those who stood up for the council,[y] was, for corrupting the scriptures in favour of his opinion, and such other things as were laid to his charge, deposed and banished, ann. C. 512.[z] But his own party (which at length prevailed) defended him, as if oppressed by calumnies; and so received that reading for genuine, which he

[x] Vide Baronium, anno 451; sect. 149, 150, 151.

[y] Evagrius, lib. iii. cap. xxi. 44.—Theodorus lector, lib. ii. and Marcellini Chronicon.

[z] Flavian was banished in the year of Antioch 561, as Evagrius notes; and Macedonius was banished the same year, or the year before.

had put about among them. For how ready are all parties to receive what they reckon on their side, Jerome well knew, when he recommended the testimony of "the Three in heaven" by its usefulness; and we have a notable instance of it in the last age, when the churches, both eastern and western, received this testimony in a moment in their Greek testaments, and still continue with great zeal and passion to defend it for the ancient reading against the authority of all the Greek manuscripts.

XVI. But now I have told you the original of the corruption, I must tell you my author; and he is Liberatus, archdeacon of the church of Carthage, who lived in that very age. For in his Breviary, which he wrote in the year 535, or soon after, and collected (as he saith in his preface) out of Greek records, he delivers it in these words:[a] "*Hoc tempore Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus ab imperatore Anastasio dicitur expulsus, tanquam evangelia falsaret; et maxime illud apostoli dictum,* Quia apparuit in carne, justificatum in spiritu. *Hunc enim mutasse, ubi habet* qui . . . . . *hoc est* . . . . . *monosyllabum Græcum, litera mutata in* . . . . . *vertisse et fecisse* . . . . . *id est, ut esset Deus, apparuit per carnem. Tanquam Nestorianus ergo culpatus expellitur per severum Monachum.*"[b] The Greek letters here omitted are, in the second edition of Sunius, and in those of the councils, thus inserted: "*Ubi habet* ὃς, *hoc est* qui; *monosyllabum Græcum, litera mutata* ο *in* ω, *vertisse, et fecisse,* ως; *id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem.*" But this interpolation was surely made by conjecture: for if Θεὸς was in the sacred text before the corruption, then ὃς or ὁ was not in, and so could not be changed into ως: but if Θεὸς

[a] Liberati Brev. cap. xix.

[b] Vide Baronii Annal. 510. sect 9.

was not in, it could not be brought in by this change. The interpolation therefore is inconsistent and spurious, and seems to have been occasioned by straining to make out Nestorianism here; the scribes for that end,[c] referring the words *ut esset* to the sacred text; and then the interpolator writing ὡς for *ut*. Whereas they should have referred *ut esset* to the words of Liberatus, thus distinguished from the sacred text; "*Id est, ut esset,* Deus apparuit per carnem." I had rather, therefore, wave the conjecture of this interpolator, and fill up the *lacunæ* by the authority of an ancient author, Hincmarus; who above eight hundred years ago[d] related the fact out of Liberatus after this manner: "*Quidam ipsa scripturas verbis illicitis impostuaverunt; sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore, ideo a civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit evangelia; et illum apostoli locum,* quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in spiritu; *per cognationem Græcarum literarum* ο *et* Θ *hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit,* qui, *hoc est* οC, *monosyllabum Græcum, litera mutata* ο *in* Θ, *mutavit, et fecit* ΘC, *id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem, quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus.*" He was banished therefore for changing the ancient reading (which in some MSS. was οC, as these authors have it, and in others ο) into ΘC. But whereas he is here represented a Nestorian, for

[c] N. B. In Hincmari opusc. xxxiii. cap. 22, the words "ut esset" are in like manner referred to the sacred text; and somebody, to make out the sense, has in their stead added "ut appareret" to the words of Liberatus, and written "ut appareret, ut esset Deus, &c." But the words "ut appareret" not being in Liberatus must be struck out, and supplied by setting the comma after "ut esset," to part these words from the sacred text.

[d] Hincmari opuscul. artic. xxxiii. cap. 18.

doing this, the meaning is, that he was banished for corrupting the text in favour of the doctrine of two natures in Christ; which his enemies accounted Nestorianism, though it was not really so. Nestorius held only a human nature in Christ; and that God, *the Word*, dwelt in this nature, as the spirit in a holy man; and therefore interpreted ὁ of the human nature. This doctrine Macedonius anathematised, and maintained two natures in Christ; and, for proving this, corrupted the text, and made it God *manifested in the flesh*. This distinguishing Christ into two natures was, by the enemies of Macedonius, accounted Nestorianism in another language; and in this respect the historian saith, that they banished him as a Nestorian for corrupting the text, though he was not really of that opinion.

XVII. But whilst he is said to be banished as a Nestorian for this, without explaining what is here meant by a Nestorian, it looks like a trickish way of speaking, used by his friends to ridicule the proceedings against him as inconsistent; perhaps to invert the crime of falsation; as if a Nestorian would rather change ΘC into O. For they that read history with judgment, will too often meet with such trickish reports; and even in the very story of Macedonius, I meet with some other reports of the same kind. For Macedonius having in his keeping the original acts of the council of Chalcedon, signed by that emperor, under whom it was called, and refusing to deliver up this book to the emperor Anastasius; some, to make this emperor perjured, distorted the story; as if, at his coming to the crown, he had promised under his hand and oath, that he would not act against the council of Chalcedon; and represented his subscribed promise to be the book, which Macedonius refused to deliver back to him. Macedonius had got his bishoprick

by being against the council of Chalcedon, and had subscribed the *henoticum*[e] of Zeno, in which that council was anathematised; and this being objected against him, his friends, to stifle the accusation, make a contrary story of the emperor; as if, when he came to the crown, he had done as much as that in behalf of the council: Another report was,[f] "That the people of Alexandria and all Egypt, great and small, bond and free, priests and monks, excepting only strangers, became about this time possessed with evil spirits, and being deprived of human speech, barked day and night like dogs; so that they were afterwards bound with iron chains, and drawn to the church, that they might recover their health. For they all ate their hands and arms. And then an angel appeared to some of the people, saying, that this happened to them, because they anathematised the council of Chalcedon, and threatened that they should do so no more." Again, we are told in history,[g] "That the adversaries of Macedonius produced certain boys in judgment to accuse both him and themselves of sodomy: but that when they found his genitals were cut off, they betook themselves to other arts for deposing him." Now if you can believe that an eunuch had the beard and voice of another man; and that in a solemn council the great patriarch of the east was thus accused and thus acquitted, and yet deposed; you must acknowledge, that there were many bishops among the Greeks who would not stick at as ill and shameless things, as corrupting the scriptures. But if all this be a sham invented to discredit the council, the need of such shams, adds credit to their proceedings in condemning him for a falsary.

[e] Vide Annotationes Valesia in Evagr, &c. lib. iii. cap. 31.
[f] Victor Turonensis in Chronico.
[g] Evagrius, lib. iii. cap. 32.

XVIII. This council (if I mistake not) sat first at Constantinople, being that council which Theodorus calls "a company of mercenary wretches." And Nicephorus, "a convention of hereticks, assembled against Macedonius." Upon their adding to the[h] "thrice holy" these words, "who art crucified for us," the people fell into a tumult: and afterwards, when Macedonius came to be accused, they fell into a greater tumult, crying out, "The time of persecution is at hand; let no man desert the father;" meaning Macedonius. In this tumult (which was said to be stirred up by the clergy of Constantinople) many parts of the city were burnt, and the nobles and emperor brought into the greatest danger; insomuch, that the emperor was forced to proffer the resignation of his empire, before he could quiet the multitude. Then seeing that if Macedonius were judged, the people would defend him, he caused him to be carried by force in the night to to Chalcedon; and thence into banishment, as Theodorus writes. Whence I gather, that the council removed also to Chalcedon to avoid the tumult, and finish their proceeding there. For the story of his being accused in judgment by boys, Nicephorus places after this tumult; and all agree that he was condemned: and the monks of Palestine, in an epistle recorded by Evagrius, say that Xenaias and Dioscorus, joined with many bishops, banished him. When his condemnation was sent him, signed by the emperor, he asked, whether they that had condemned him, received the council of Chalcedon; and when they that brought him the sentence denied it, he replied, "If Arians and Macedonians had sent me a book of condemnation, could I receive it?" So that it seems he stood upon

[h] Theodor. lib. ii.——Nicephor. lib. xvi. cap. 26.——Evagr. lib. iii. cap. 44.

the illegality of the council. The next day one Timothy was made bishop of Constantinople, and he sent about the condemnation of Macedonius to all the absent bishops to be subscribed.[1] Whence I think it will easily be granted, that he was condemned as a falsary by the greatest part of the eastern empire; and by consequence, that the genuine reading was till then, by the churches of that empire, accounted ὁ. For had not the public reading then been ὁ, there could have been no colour for pretending that he changed it into ΘC.

XIX. About six years after Anastasius died, and his successors Justin and Justinian set up the authority of the council of Chalcedon again, together with that of the Pope over the eastern churches, as universal bishop; and from that time the friends of Macedonius prevailing, it is probable, that in opposition to the hereticks, which condemned him, and for promoting and establishing the doctrine of two natures in Christ, they received and spread abroad the reading OC. But as for the authority of the Pope, that fell again with Rome in the Gothic wars, and slept till Phocas revived it.

XX. I told you of several shams put about by the friends of Macedonius, to discredit the proceedings of the council against him. There is one which notably confirms what has hitherto been said, and makes it plain that his friends received his corruptions as genuine scripture. For whereas Macedonius was banished for corrupting the New Testament, his friends retorted the crime upon the council, as if they had taken upon them, under colour of purging the scriptures from the corruptions of Macedonius, to correct in them whatever they thought the apostles, as unskilful men and ideots, had written amiss. For this I gather from an ironi-

[1] Theophanes, p. 135.

cal report of this kind put about in the west, and thus recorded by Victor Turonensis. "*Messala V. C. consulibus, Constantinopoli, jubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta evangelia, tanquam ab idiotis composita, reprehenduntur et emendantur:*" that is, "In the consulship of Messala, the holy gospels, by the command of the emperor Anastasius, were censured and corrected at Constantinople; as if written by evangelists that were ideots." Here Victor errs in the year. For Messala was consul anno Christi 506, that is, six years before the banishment of Macedonius. But Victor is very uncertain in dates of the years: for he places the banishment of Macedonius in the consulship of Avienus 502; and the above-mentioned tumult about the *Trisagium* in the consulship of Probus, anno Christi 513; whereas all these things happened in the same year. For it is plain by this chronicle, that the scriptures were examined and corrected about this time by a council at Constantinople, by the order of Anastasius; and I meet with no other council to which this character can agree, besides that which deposed Macedonius. Now that they should censure and correct the gospels, as if written by idiots, is too plainly ironical to be true history; and therefore it must be an abusive report invented and put about to ridicule and shame the council, and to propagate the corruptions of Macedonius as the genuine apostolic reading of the scriptures, which the council had rashly corrected.

XXI. So then the falsation was set on foot in the beginning of the fifth century, and is now of about twelve hundred years standing; and therefore since it lay but in a letter, and so was more easily spread abroad in the Greek manuscripts than the testimony of "the Three in heaven" in the Latin ones; we need not wonder if the old reading be

scarce to be met with in any Greek manuscripts now extant, and yet it is in some.

XXII. For though Beza tells us, that all the Greek manuscripts read Θεος; yet I must tell Beza's readers, that all his manuscripts read ὁ. For he had no other manuscripts of the epistles besides the Claromontan; and in this manuscript, as Morinus by ocular inspection has since informed us, the ancient reading was ὁθ;[k] but yet in another hand, and with other ink, the letter Θ has been written out of the line; and the letters ο thickened to make a C, appears: which instance shews sufficiently by whom the ancient reading has been changed. Valesius also read ὁ in one of the Spanish manuscripts; and so did the author of the Oxford edition of the New Testament, anno Christi 1675, in the manuscript of Lincoln College library, which is the oldest of the Oxford manuscripts. The Alexandrian MS.[l] and one of Colbert's and Cyril, c. 12. Scholiorum, (teste Photio MS. com. in epist.) read ΟC. So

[k] "Alia manu et atramento, extra lineæ seriem, addita est litera Θ, et ambesa paululum O, ut appareret sigma. Sed præpostera emendatio facile conspicitur." Hæc Morinus in exercitationibus Biblicis, lib. i. Exercitat. ii. cap. 4.——At Beza nobis aliqua invidit, ut ex ejus epistola ad Academiam Cantabrigiensem à Waltono editam liquet; ubi variantes aliquas lectiones celandas esse admonet.

[l] Alio atramento jam ducta cernitur tam lineola per medium literæ O, quam virgula superna; ut jam legatur ΘC. Putat autem Millius, lineolas illas olim tenues fuisse et prope evanidas, et novo dein atramento incrassatas fuisse; eo quod perlustrato attentius loco, lineolæ per medium Θ ductæ, quæ primam aciem fugerat, ductus quosdam ac vestigia satis certa deprehendere visus esset; præsertim ad partem sinistram, quæ peripheriam literæ pertingit: luculentiora multo habiturus nisi obstante litura quam dixit hodierna lineolæ ipsi superinducta. Verum si lineola antiquitus tam conspicua esset, ut usque nunc per medium lineæ crassioris, alio atramento superinductæ, cerni possit; quid opus esset, ut à lineâ

then there are some ancient Greek manuscripts which read ὁ, and others ὅς; but I do not hear of any Latin ones, either ancient or modern, which read Θεος.

XXIII. And besides, to read Θεος makes the sense obscure and difficult. For how can it properly be said, "that God was justified in the spirit?"[m] But to read ὁ, and interpret it of Christ, as the ancient Christians did, without restraining it to his divinity, makes the sense very easy. For the promised and long-expected Messias, the hope of Israel, is to us "the great mystery of godliness." And this mystery was at length manifested to the Jews from the time of his baptism, and justified to be the person whom they expected.

XXIV. I have now given you an account of the corruption of the text, the sum of which is this: the difference between the Greek and the ancient versions puts it past dispute, that either the Greeks have corrupted their MSS. or the Latins, Syrians, and Ethiopians, their versions: and it is more reasonable to lay the fault upon the Greeks than

illâ superinducta incrassaretur. Sin olim tam evanida esset, ut cerni vix posset; mirum est, quod ejus ductus et vestigia satis certa, per medium literæ illius superinductæ, etiamnum appareant. Doceant verba evanida aliis in locis atramento novo incrassata fuisse, vel fateantur OC hic mutatum in ΘC.

[m] How is it said in St. Luke, that "publicans justified God" by receiving John's baptism? If to read Θεος gives a difficult sense in this clause, to read ὁ, will it give an easy sense in others? Are the propositions, that a mystery was manifested in the flesh, a mystery was received up into glory, both which arise from the reading ὁ very easily intelligible? Is it easy to understand what mystery was manifested in the flesh, if our Lord's divinity is set out of the question? If it be allowed that his divinity makes the mystery, the two readings will be equivalent in sense, but Θεος makes the best construction.

upon the other three, for these considerations. It was easier for one nation to do it than for three to conspire. It was easier to change a letter or two in the Greek, than six words in the Latin. In the Greek, the sense is obscure; in the versions, clear. It was agreeable to the interest of the Greeks, to make the change, but against the interest of other nations to do it; and men are never false to their interest. The Greek reading was unknown in the times of the Arian controversy; but that of the versions then in use amongst both Greeks and Latins. Some Greek MSS. render the Greek reading dubious; but those of the versions hitherto collated agree There are no signs of corruption in the versions, hitherto discovered; but in the Greek we have shewed you particularly when, on what occasion, and by whom, the text was corrupted.

XXV. I know not whether it be worth the while to tell you, that in the printed works of Athanasius, there is an epistle, *De incarnatione verbi*, which reads Θεος. For this epistle relates to the Nestorian heresy, and so was written by a much later author than Athanasius, and may also possibly have been since corrected (like the works of Chrysostom and Cyril) by the corrected texts of St. Paul's epistles. I have had so short a time to run my eye over authors, that I cannot tell whether, upon further search, more passages about this falsation may not hereafter occur pertinent to the argument. But if there should, I presume it will not be difficult, now the falsation is thus far laid open, to know what construction to put upon them, and how to apply them.

XXVI. You see what freedom I have used in this discourse, and I hope you will interpret it candidly. For if the ancient churches, in debating and deciding the greatest mysteries of religion, knew nothing of these two texts, I understand not, why

we should be so fond of them now the debates are over. And whilst it is the character of an honest man to be pleased, and of a man of interest to be troubled at the detection of frauds, and of both to run most into those passions when the detection is made plainest; I hope this letter will, to one of your integrity, prove so much the more acceptable, as it makes a further discovery than you have hitherto met with in commentators.

Thus far Sir Isaac Newton.

WITH the foregoing pieces of religious criticism I shall conclude that part of this volume which professedly relates to *Unitarian* faith. It is possible that some of my readers may think that too much had been said on the subject; but I beg leave to offer my belief to the contrary. The mind which most needs such instruction, will not fail to be profitted by a calm attentive perusal, if it be only by losing a part of its prejudices against the moral character and seriousness of Unitarian writers; but I will indulge a hope that they will profit still further by an improved understanding. Those who had been before so far convinced of these principles as not absolutely to need so much reasoning and proof from scripture, may nevertheless be edified by the copious selection which has been laid before them. The pieces were indeed all known to a few liberal students among the various societies in this country; but I believe not generally. The Last

Thoughts of Dr. Whitby had been faithfully published according to his final directions; but such, it seems, was the alarm they excited among modern churchmen, that the copies were soon industriously bought up, and those which escaped are become very scarce, insomuch they are rarely to be met with. The deficiency may now be considered as supplied, for the use of the society of *Friends* at least. The truly interesting pieces by Sir Isaac Newton were nearly as little known: and the great expence of the quarto edition of his works, in which they are found, must have operated against their being generally read or heard of, by numerous readers, even of classical qualifications: and it will readily be allowed that the foregoing copy is of much greater value than the small cost of this volume. The following extracts and reflections on another most awful and important subject, will, I trust, be equally acceptable to the lovers of gospel truth: to those especially, who, with me, are delighted with the most amiable doctrines of the Divine benevolence. The understandings of the multitude among religious believers have been too long and extensively abused, by the assertion of doctrines of a tremendous tendency: doctrines, which, while they have impiously represented the heavenly Father as a most cruel and implacable being, have caused peculiar unhappiness and secret distress of mind. And these effects, so far as they have spread, have mournfully restricted that lively consoling reverence, with which the more enlightened believer approaches the altar of the living God. Such is my most sincere and solemn belief. And I am fully persuaded, that in these attempts to counteract such lamented effects I am employed in a worthy and most necessary service. Every favourable construction of our endeavours to pro-

mote the cause of religious truth and happiness, must be in some degree grateful to the human mind; and I am not without feelings of pleasure from that quarter. It has been, and will doubtless remain to be grateful to me, to have it supposed, that at least my sentiments flow from a source of benevolence in my own mind. But I must here take occasion to say, that such a kind of praise has a very feeble charm for me, in comparison of being enabled to carry conviction into the minds of others, that I am advocating the cause of *eternal truth.*

I shall conclude my remarks in this place with a quotation from the author of the *Monthly Review* of a work on the same subject, in May 1803.

"*How long will the ministers of Christ have a seeming pleasure in representing the Deity as inflicting, and their frail fellow-beings as enduring, eternal torments? Such a doctrine cannot make any part of the contents of a revelation truly divine:* WE FIND IT NOT IN THE GOSPEL!"

W. M.

EXTRACTS and REFLECTIONS

ON THE

Scripture Doctrines of Future Punishments.

That the English words eternal, everlasting, for ever and ever, *&c. are unscriptural, and express not the true import of the original words* (αιων עלם) æon olem.

SECT. I.

The word עלם *olem, its meaning and force.*

THE word עלם olem (or עולם owlem) which the Septuagint translate (wherever it respects time) by the Greek word αιων, (and which translation seems to have been the occasion of the frequent use of that word αιων afterward amongst the Greek christians) it is well known, is usually in our Old, as is also the word αιων in our New Testament, rendered by the English words *eternal, everlasting*, and *without end;* but how justly, is the question in debate.

This word עלם olem, among the Hebrews, signified, as a verb, to hide, to conceal, to reserve in darkness and secrecy;[a] as a noun, uncertain, inde-

[a] Thus Job xxviii. 21, *it is hid* (λελησθε; נעלמה it hideth itself) *from the eyes of all living, and kept close from the fowls of the air.* Eccl. xii. 14, God *shall bring every work to judgment with every secret thing,* (כל נעלם) *whether it be good or*

finite, undetermined, undeclared; and consequently, applied to a person, it means an uncertain indeterminate person;[b] and applied to time (its only use which at present concerns us) an *indefinite, undeclared*, though *very long*, time.[c]

The word αιων among the Greeks signified, in its genuine meaning, an age; or so long as very old men live, a term of about an hundred years; yet sometimes the Greeks applied it to a much longer term than one hundred years, and sometimes to a shorter term:[d] So that the word αιων aion, corres-

whether it be evil. Ps. x. 1, *Why standest thou afar off, O* LORD, *why hidest thou thyself* (תעלים) *in time of trouble?* So Lev. iv. 13; v. 2, 3, 4; Num. xv. 13; 2 Kings iv. 27; Job xlii. 3; Lam. iii. 56; Nah. iii. 11; 1 Kings x. 3; Prov. xxviii. 27; Is. i. 15.; Ps. xliv. 21.

[b] 1 Sam. xvii. 56, *And the king said, enquire thou whose son this unknown person* (וה העלם, *i. e.* הנער, see v. 55) *is.* Gen. xxiv. 43, *Behold I stand by the well of water, and it shall come to pass, that when that unknown woman* (העלמה, *i. e.* אשה, see v. 40) *cometh forth to draw water, and I say unto her*, &c.

[c] Ex. xii. 14, *And you shall keep this day a feast by an ordinance* (עולם) *of long undetermined antiquity.* Is. lxi. 4, *And ye shall build up the desolations* (עולם *owlem*) *of long undetermined antiquity.* Jer. xxv. 9, *I will bring Nebuchadnezzar against this land, and against the nations round about, and will destroy them utterly, and make them deserts* (עולם *owlem*) *of long undetermined antiquity.* Mich. ii. 9, *The women of my people (of Judah) have ye (Israelites) cast out from their pleasant houses, from their children have ye taken away my glory* (לעולם) *for an age, or long undetermined season.*

[d] αιων signifies the space of an hundred years, though the destruction of the Jews foretold Matt. xiii. 40, (εν τη συντελειᾳ τȣ αιωνος τȣτȣ) came to pass before fifty years. See *Leigh's Critica Sacra*, upon the word αιων; and Tully, it seems, renders this Greek word by the Latin word *annus* a year, and by *seculum* an age.

ponds tolerably with the word עלם olem in its use, though not in its natural import; for though αιων æon signifies, not as עלם olem, *hidden, covered, concealed, indefinite, unascertained*, yet as applied to *time* it denotes, what is very like this, *a long* though *undetermined* portion or period of time.

SECT. II.

The word (αιων) means not eternity.

HOWEVER, that the word αιων æon, even in the scripture acceptation of it, cannot signify what we moderns mean by the word *eternity*, will appear for the following reasons:

First, Because such meaning of it is in many instances repugnant to other parts of scripture; so 2 Cor. iv. 4, *In whom the* GOD τȣ αιωνος τȣτȣ *of this æon has blinded the minds of them that believe not*, &c. Now supposing the word æon to mean *age*, and not eternity,[e] Satan may here be aptly exhibited to us in this grand and horrible description of him, the god of this age, or *æon;* but it were blasphemy to call him the god of *eternity*, besides the absurdity of stiling him the god of *this* eternity; for the word *this*, so used, must imply some other eternity besides the present, and two eternities are an inconsistency in terms.

[e] Since the words αιων αιωνιος, עולם עלם olem owlem, have no word in the English language that will answer their use, I shall beg leave, as I shall have occasion, to make use of the words *æon*, *æonian*, to express them. Also, as the word *eternity* in the modern notion of it (though not in its natural import) means a *perpetuity*, *endless* and *never ceasing*, I shall henceforward mean thus much by the terms *eternal* and *eternity*.

Again, Eph. vi. 12, *We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers of the darkness* τȣ αιωνος τȣτȣ *of this æon.* But translate the word æon, here, *eternity*, and this passage would be, *against the rulers of the darkness of this eternity.* So 1 Cor. i. 20, *Where is the wise, where is the scribe, where is the disputer* τȣ αιωνος τȣτȣ *of this æon*, and not of *this eternity.* 1 Tim. ii. 6, *Charge them that are rich* εν τω νυν αιωνι *in the now æon*, (not in the now eternity) *that they be not high-minded*, &c. So Tim. ii. 12, *That denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly* εν τω νυν αιωνι *in the now æon;* so Matt. xiii. 22, The seed among the thorns is *he that heareth the word, and the care* τȣ αιωνος τȣτȣ *of this æon*, (not of this eternity) *and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful*, &c. For what common sense can endure that the word αιων æon, in these places, should be thus rendered by the word *eternity?*[f]

The term αιων *in the scripture no substitute for the term* κοσμος.

[f] The translators of our New Testament, sensible of this absurdity, have rendered the word αιων age in these places (as if a substitute or succedaneum for κοσμος) by the word *world;* viz. The rulers of this (αιων) world, the disputers of this (αιων) world, the rich in the present (αιων) world, &c. But without reaching the intention of the scripture, for it is the *age*, and not the world, which the scripture every where complains of. The worldly inhabitants of the present age are wicked; but the worldly inhabitants of a future age shall be righteous. The ruler of darkness in (*i. e.* the dark ruler of) this age is Satan; the ruler of a succeeding age, even upon this world of ours, will be Jesus Christ.

So that the cares of this *æon* are the cares of the people of this *age;* and a conformity to this *æon* is a conformity to the people of this *age*, &c. And so εις τον αιωνα, though it may be rendered phraseologically as long as the world stands, yet in its true force it means as long as the *age* (that is, the great

Secondly, That the word αιων does *not* signify *eternity* is also clear, because there was a time before (αιων) æon was, yea before the æons plural were; *e. g.* Acts xv. 18, *Known unto* GOD *are all his*

age of wickedness, which comprehends many other lesser ages of the same kind) endures. This world will weather out many ages, and that not only the ages of rebellion, but also ages of godliness and peace. To suppose therefore the word αιων æon age, to be equivocal with the word κοσμος kosmos, world, is without farther proof unreasonable: But besides this, and besides that we have no precedent for translating it so out of any of the Greek heathen authors, whose works are transmitted down to our times, this way of translating the word will also make many scripture passages, more than absurd, even errant nonsense, as the few following examples, which have very many like them, will demonstrate.

The term αιων, then, being translated *world*, the following texts will be translated as follows:—Matt. vi. 13, *Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory*, (εις τȣς αιωνας) to the worlds. John vi. 15, *He that eateth of this bread shall live* (εις τον αιωνα) to the world; ch. xi. 26, *He shall not die* (εις τον αιωνα) to the world. Heb. xiii. 8, Jesus Christ *the same yesterday, to-day*, (και εις τȣς αιωνας) and to the worlds. Rom. xiv. 11, *The smoke of their torments ascendeth up* (εις αιωνα αιωνων) to a world of worlds. Heb. xiii. 20, *The* GOD *of peace who through the blood* (διαθηκης αιωνου) of the worldly covenant. Matt. xix. 16, *The rich man says to our* LORD, *what shall I do to have* (ζωην αιωνιον) worldly life. 1 Tim. vi. 12, *Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on* (αιωνιȣ ζωης) worldly life. John xii. 25, *He that hateth his life* (εν τω κοσμω τȣτω) in this world, *shall keep it* (εις ζωην αιωνιον) to worldly life. Rom. xvi. 26, *According to the commandment* (τȣ αιωνιȣ θεȣ) of the worldly god. Heb. ix. 14, Christ *who* (δια πνευματος αιωνιȣ) through the worldly *spirit offered himself to* GOD, &c.

But what common sense will admit of the strange impertinence of the above translations of the terms αιων, αιωνιος?

So that unless we claim a like use of the word æon as is related of a nose of wax, which its owner could convert and transform at pleasure, its vulgar translations (namely, *world*, *eternal*, &c.) must be renounced.

works (απ' αιωνος) *since the æon* (*i. e.* the great comprehensive æon) *began.* Acts iii. 21, *Spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets* (απ' αιωνος) *since the æon began* John ix. 32, (εκ τυ αιωνος) *Since the æon began, was it not heard that,* &c. And in the same sense are used *æons, ages,* in the plural number; *e. g.* 1 Cor. ii. 7, *The hidden mystery of* GOD *pre-ordained unto his glory* (προ των αιωνων) *before the æons began, which none of the princes* (τυ αιωνος τυτυ) *of this æon knew.* Eph. iii. 9, *The mystery which has been hid in* GOD (απο των αιωνων) *from the beginning of the æons.* Col. i. 26, *The mystery that has been hid* (απο των αιωνων κ̀ απο των γενεων) *from the æons and the generations, but now is made manifest unto his saints.*

Thirdly, It is evident again, that the word *æon* cannot signify *eternity,* because there are more æons than one; whereas *eternity, everlastingness,* and *for ever,* must be an individual, as implying an unity of consistence, and simple continuance. Luke xx. 34, *And* Jesus *said unto them, the children* (τυ αιωνος τυτυ) of this æon *marry and are given in marriage, but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain* (τυ αιωνος εκεινυ) that other æon, *and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage,* &c.

Here we find *this* and *that,* and consequently two *æons,* a distinction observable in many parts of scripture; so 1 Cor. ii. 6, *Yet not the wisdom* (τυ αιωνος τυτυ) *of this æon which comes to nought.* Rom. xii. 2, *Be not conformed* (τω αιωνι τυτω) *to this æon.* And in a like distinguishing sense we often find mentioned the *cares,* the *wisdom,* the *men,* the *things,* the *children* (τυ αιωνος τυτυ) of *this æon;* all which imply that there must be some *other æon* beside the present, and consequently more æons than one.

Fourthly, That the word *æon* cannot mean *eternity*, is evident yet farther, because there are not only more *æons* than one, but these *æons* succeed one the other, as the links of a chain, the one beginning where the other ends; *e. g.* Matt. xii. 32, *But whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither* (εν τυτω τω αιωνι) *in this æon,* (ουτε εν τω μελλοντι) *nor in that to come.* Eph. i. 21, *And set him at his own right-hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only* (εν τω αιωνι τυτω) *in this æon, but also in that which is to come.* Gal. i. 4, *Who gave himself for our sins, that he might seize us* (εκ τυ ενεςωτος αιωνος πονηρυ) *out of this present wicked æon.* Eph. ii. 7, *That* (εν τοις αιωσι τοις επερχομενοις) *in the æons to come, he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace.* So 2 Tim. iv. 10, Demas *is said to have forsaken* Paul, *because of his love to the present æon.* Whereas Christians are described, Heb. vi. 4, 5, *Such as have tasted of the heavenly gift, and have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of* God, *and the power (or virtue) of the æon to come.*—[See the Syriac.]

The present *æon*, therefore, as it began, so will it also end; and in its end be succeeded by an *æon* to unfold itself in a most essential difference and dissimilitude from the past.

Fifthly, From hence also it appears again, That the word (αιων) *æon*, cannot mean *eternity*, because it *must end*, and be *no more;* of which we have further assurance, Matt. xxviii. 20, *And lo I am with you* (πασας τας ἡμερας) all the days, *even to the end* (τυ αιωνος) *of the æon.* Matt. xiii. 29, *The harvest is the end* (τυ αιωνος) *of the æon;* v. 40, *So shall it be in the end* (τυ αιωνος τυτυ) *of this æon.*

Matt. xxiv. 3, *What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end* (τȣ αιωνȣ) *of the æon.*

Sixthly, And not only *æon* singly and indefinitely, but (οι αιωνες) the *æons* plural, shall also have an end. Heb. ix. 26, *But now once about (or towards) the conclusion (or closing up together) of the æons* (επι συντελεια των αιωνων) *he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* 1 Cor. x. 11, *And they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends* (των αιωνων) *of the æons are come.*

SECT. III.

Farther remarks upon the word (αιων) *æon.*

THOUGH the word (αιων) æon to a cursory reader may seem only a trite familiar term, of no other import than vulgar use has given it; yet if one critically observe its variety, use, and acceptations in scripture, one may easily suspect that very mysterious truths may be couched in the diversity of its forms, and peculiarity of its applications. At least the *æons*, intelligently observed, must appear to be periods or portions of time, working together, by a divine mechanism, the will of GOD. For it is clear they have their beginning and end in what we call time, and are circumscribed by it, in the same manner as the several spherical systems that seem to mete out the universe, are altogether comprehended in space, are wholly circumscribed by it. And as the many systems of worlds promote and

act their several appointed tasks in the boundless tracks and vast embrace of space: thus the *æons*, operating in the capacity of *time*, have their several changes and revolutions to disclose, their several courses of mercies and judgments to exhibit, their several degrees of revelations and disciplines to unfold, with variety of strange and unsearchable parts, and expedients, and issues, to produce, towards the successive reconciling, digesting, and ripening the many creatures subsisting in them to the various purposes of GOD, and to their glorious ends and uses in eternity, or when time itself shall be no more.

Here many, convicted with these evidences of the temporal purport of the word *æon*, contend, that though in its proper signification and common use it may not denote eternity, yet that when applied to things of an eternal nature, its meaning is enhanced, and it acquires, in scripture language, their force. That thus when we read of believers, *That*, Luke xvii. 13, John xi. 26, *they shall live, or that they shall not die* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age. *That*, John xiv. 16, *the comforter shall abide with them* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age. *That*, 1 John ii. 2, *the truth shall dwell in them* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age. And of *Christ*, John xii. 34, Heb. vii. 24, *that he abideth, continueth* [see the Syriac] to the age. *That*, 2 Cor. ix. 9, Heb. i. 8, 1 Pet. i. 23, 1 John ii. 17, *his righteousness, his throne, his word, his will, remaineth, abideth, continueth* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age. *That*, Heb. v. 6, vii. 28, Christ *is a priest, and consecrated* [as in the Syriac] to the age. *That*, Heb. xiii. 8, *he is the same yesterday, to-day, and* [Syriac] to the age.[g] *And*

[g] It is observed by some, and it seems very justly, that the Syriac word among the Jews, rendered in Greek by εις τον αιωνα, was a sort of phrase or idiomatical expression of com-

that glory be to him (εις τȣς αιωνȣς των αιωνων) to the ages of the ages. We cannot understand by the word *æon*, so applied to these promises, declarations, and doxologies, any time short of *eternity*.

mon use, to signify at random a long doubtful time, as when we say in English, while the world stands.

So we read 1 John iii. 8, *Peter said, thou shalt never* (εις τον αιωνα to the age) *wash my feet.* Matt. xxi. 19, *Let no fruit grow on thee henceforth* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *or while the world stands.* John viii. 35, *The son abideth in the house (viz. of his father,* εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *or continually, or as long as he lives.* John vi. 51, *He that eateth this bread, shall live* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *or continually.* 1 Cor. viii. 13, *If meat maketh my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *or continually, or while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.* John xii. 34, *We have heard that* Christ *abideth* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *or continually, i. e.* without leaving the earth.

Now if this be so, the frequent application of the Syriac phrase (rendered εις τον αιωνα) to things truly *æonian* is very accountable; for in the Hebrew and other eastern languages we observe a familiar use of the figure *Meiosis*, whereby, as say the rhetoricians, *res extenuatur ultra verum*, or *minus dicitur quam intelligitur;* that is, whereby more is implied in an expression than that expression naturally imports.

So Rom. iv. 19, *And being not weak in faith,* &c. Here the extenuating term not *weak*, the Apostle explains in the following verse as meaning (v. 20) *being strong in faith.* Rev. xii. 11, *And they loved not their souls unto death;* i. e. John xii. 25, *And they hated their souls unto death.* Heb. xi. 16, *Wherefore* God *is not ashamed to be called their* God. By the expression *not ashamed* we are here to understand that Isaiah, lxii. 4, *He is delighted to be called their* God. So Acts xvii. 28, *He* (God) *is not far from every one of us, for in him we live, and move, and have our being;* by the expression *not far from,* we are to understand most intimately *present* with every one of us: But to illustrate this the better, I will here present to your view a few instances of this vulgar Jewish phrase [see Syriac] lolm, (that is, εις τον αιωνα) to the age, in contrast with a few other instances of the figure Meiosis in scripture use.

But is not this cavilling rather than arguing? If I were to say, that though the word smooth in its proper signification do not denote roundness, yet that when applied to a bowl which is in its own

The figure Meiosis used in the Syriac phrase (or εις τον αιωνα) to the age. For in this phrase, though itself *expresses* only a less, intelligible, and decisive period; is *imported* yet a larger, unintelligible, & undetermined period. [See Syriac.]

John iv. 14, *He that drinketh of this water shall not thirst* [see Syriac] (or εις τον αιωνα) to the age; that is, to the utmost limits of this present secular state of our existence; hereby however is implied other succeeding periods still far beyond.

John xiv. 16, *That he* (i. e. *the comforter*) *may abide with you* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *i. e.* and not only so, but to periods unknown, and far beyond the age.

Luke i. 33, *And he shall reign over Jacob* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *i. e.* and not only so, but to periods far beyond this, even continually.

John x. 28, *And they shall not perish* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age, *i. e.* and not only so, but also for periods far beyond this, even to the utmost æon.

Matt. iii. 29, *He that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven,* (εις τον αιωνα) to the age; *i. e.*

The figure Meiosis used in terms, which though *expressing* only moderate and diminutive particulars; yet *import* particulars of a far larger and sublimer nature.

Other Instances in contrast.

Is. xl. 28, *Hast thou not known, that the æonian* God, *Jehovah, the creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not?* The greatness of Jehovah is here expressed only in his being creator of the ends of the earth; yet in this diminishing particular he is to be understoood as God, the founder of all the universe.

Ps. lxxii. 11, *Kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall worship him.* (ver. 17) *His name shall be continued as long as the sun, and all nations shall call him blessed.* Here again, though the worship of kings and nations only are expressed, yet under them all the powers of heaven and all the realms of other worlds are implied, as also to become his worshippers. So again, though his reign is here expressed only by the continuance of the sun, yet thereby is imported the far exceeding extent of his dominion and authority even to the end of the æons.

nature round, this term *smooth* acquires one and the same import with the word round; and that therefore when I say a smooth bowl, I must mean a round bowl; would you not laugh?

If it be a just inference that because the word *æon* is often applied in scripture to eternal things, therefore it must mean eternal; it may be as fairly pronounced that the word *smooth* is often applied to round things, therefore it must denote *roundness*.

Again, if the word *æon* be to signify eternity only when adjunct to objects of a supposed eternity, this its comprehensive import being no more than its

and not only so, but also far beyond this.

Lam. v. 19, *Thou Jehovah shalt remain* (לעולם lowlem) *to the age, and thy throne to generation and generation*; *i. e.* shall remain not only to the age, but also to a duration infinitely beyond human conception, even to eternity; for, as has been by many observed, the scriptures, which delight in types and analogy, do usually intend far more in their letter than the verbal scribe is aware of, or the critical infidel will venture to acknowledge, though to the seeing eye it be easily discernible.

Ps. cxxi. 6, *The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night; Jehovah shall preserve thee from all evil.* Though the particulars from which Jehovah's people shall be preserved, are here expressed by the heat of the sun and moon, yet therein is intended all the evils of fallen nature, both in our present, and in our every other state of life.

Ps. xc. 2. *Before the mountains were brought forth, and thou hadst formed the earth and world, and from age to age thou art* God. And so again in this passage, by the terms *before the mountains were brought forth*, there is no doubt but we must understand far more than the words themselves do naturally import.

So then in the scantiness of scripture terms, we have often to expect a meaning of the greatest latitude; and yet that latitude discovered will not prove any natural and adequate comprehensiveness in the terms implying it.

object gives it, one needs only deny the eternity of the object, and the comprehensiveness (*i. e.* the eternal import) of the adjunct fails with it.

In other words, if the term smooth be to denote roundness only when adjunct to objects of a supposed roundness, one need only to deny that an object is round, and then the word smooth ceases to denote its roundness.

Again, if the word (αιωνιος) æonian is not to prove the eternity of the noun substantive to which it is adjunct, but the said noun substantive the eternal import of its adjunct (αιωνιος) æonian, then is the term (αιωνιος) æonian, become as useless towards any proof of a thing's eternity as if it had never been applied to it at all.

Or in other words, if the term smooth be not to ascertain the roundness of a bowl, but the bowl (which is called smooth) be to ascertain a globular import in the term smooth, then does the term smooth become as useless towards any proof of an object's being a bowl, as if it had never been applied to it at all.

In short, as the word smooth does not import a globular form, neither does the word *æonian* import an eternal duration; and therefore as one may call a bowl a smooth body without denoting thereby that it is globular, so one may call an eternal object *æonian*, without denoting thereby that it is eternal.

However, not to be tedious upon this absurdity, I shall prove lastly as follows:

SECT. IV.

PROPOSITION.—*To things of an eternal nature (or supposed by our adversaries to be so) terms of a finite limited intention may be applied, without having such their natural limited import changed, without becoming thereby characters of eternity.*

PSALM lxxxix. 36, *His seed* (לשלם יהיה) *shall be æonian, and his throne as the sun before me; it shall be established* (עולם) *æonially, as the moon, and as the rainbow,* (or faithful witness in heaven.) Ver. 29, *His seed also* (שמתי לעד) *I establish secularly,* (or to a seculum, age) *and his throne as the days of heaven.* Ps. lxxii. 5, *They* (*i. e.* the church) *shall revere thee as long as the sun and moon endureth, throughout all generations.* Ver. 17, *His name shall be* (לעולם) to the æons, *his name shall be continued as long as the sun.*

Now since these passages, and many others of like expression, apply the establishment of the sun, the duration of the moon, of the rainbow, of the days of heaven, of an age, and of the generations of men, in order to illustrate the continuance of the church of GOD, and of the seed of CHRIST and of his throne, and kingdom, and name, and glory, without supposing any alteration in nature, without supposing any unnatural continuance of such sun, moon, rainbow, age, or days of heaven; why must these things, *viz.* the throne, the kingdom, the name, the glory of CHRIST, because of their eternal nature, have a different effect upon the words (עלם αων) *olm, æon,* when applied to them?

The duration of the sun, moon, and rainbow, is allowed to be only temporal, notwithstanding things of an eternal nature are compared to their continuance; why then may not the words עלם and αιων retain the temporal import which is natural to them, notwithstanding they may therein be applied to eternal things?

Yea, and unless the terms *olm* and *æon* import a duration as far short of the word eternity, in our modern notion of it, as is the duration of the sun, moon, rainbow, and generations, which must all pass away, and reach their end; the holy writers mislead us in blending the expressions (לעלם and corresponding Syriac) lolm (*i. e.* εις τον αιωνα, to the age) with the duration of the sun, moon, rainbow, and generations, in one and the same sentence, and as if terms of equal force; since by such application they teach and unteach, averring the same things to be of finite duration and of infinite duration, in one and the same line. For if it be needful to believe, that our Saviour's throne, and his church, and his name, as head of such, shall endure to *ail* eternity, then is that a misleading comparison which shall date its perpetuity by the enduring of the sun, moon, rainbow, and generations, which all must pass away.

And on the other hand, if it be not a point needful to be believed, that the LORD's throne and church shall continue to all eternity; then may we without scruple declare aloud, that the word (αιων) *æon* means not eternity, and that the idea of eternity can never be proved by the word *æon* in any form of it; and that whatever part of speech we may shift it into, it can no more pronounce the eternity of any thing, by becoming its adjunct, than the duration of the sun, moon, rainbow, or foundations of the world can pronounce the eternity of the subject with which they, or any of them, may stand in comparison.

Yea a man might with a more tolerable assurance suppose the sun and moon to be eternal, than that the word *æonian* means eternal; because the scripture no where says, in express terms, that the sun and moon shall pass away; whereas it declares in express terms that the earth shall pass away and that on that earth so to pass away, the seed of Abraham shall have the land of Canaan for an *æonian* possession. So Gen. xvii. 8, *And I will give unto thee, and thy seed after thee, all the land of Canaan for an æonian* (עולם) *possession*, Gen. xiii. 15, (עד עולם) *even to an æon*, Exod. xxxii. 13, *and they shall inherit it æonianly* (לעלם) *to an æon.* Is. ix. 21, *They shall inherit the land* (לשלם) *to an æon*; Ezek. xxxvii. 25, *and they shall dwell therein, even they and their children, and their children's children* (עד עולם) *even to an æon, and my servant David shall be their Prince* (לעולם) *even to an æon.*

But if after certain *æons* are passed away, 2 *Pet.* iii. 10, *The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and all the works that are therein, shall be burnt up;* what must then become of the *æonian* land of *Canaan?* From the face of our Saviour, Rev. xx. 11, *The earth and heaven shall fly away;* and will not the land of *Canaan* fly away with it? How then will it be, or have been, an *æonian* possession to the seed of Abraham, supposing *æonian* to mean eternal? When at the last day the stars shall fall from heaven, and all the worlds we see, starting from their spheres, shall crush together in one vast ruin, our little world will be lost in the immense combustion; and then must the land of Canaan also be no more.

And if the land of Canaan will not be an eternal possession to the seed of Abraham, then neither is

it promised to be so, and consequently the term (עלם) *olm* cannot mean eternal, but still it must mean an *æonian* possession: and as we have already shewn that there are many *æons*, and that these *æons* will succeed one the other, and at last will all of them have an end, we must search for the meaning of the word (αιωνιος) *æonios* in time, and not in eternity.

STONEHOUSE.

From the foregoing arguments of this pious and learned author may be inferred the following important points:

1. That the original words usually rendered *eternity, eternal, everlasting*, and *for ever and ever*, in our English bible, do not necessarily mean *infinite duration*.

2. That *that* idea, wherever properly admitted, must be governed by connecting and illustrative words or passages, or by the peculiar nature of the subject.

3. That *that* idea can never be admitted in connexion with *material* subjects; or with dispensations, wherein the Divine Being, in the punishment of accountable creatures, is at all concerned: because that would be inconsistent with his declared and gracious purposes of universal mercy to his rational creation. And this doctrine is abundantly confirmed by the whole tenor of divine revelation.

From the strong irrefutable evidence of the foregoing deductions, and those of similar import, it has become a difficulty, in the view of various writers of undoubted piety, how the doctrine of future retribution of rewards and punishments can be more consistently received, than by understanding *literally*

a final death or abolishment of being to the incorrigibly wicked. And that at the final day of resurrection, when those who shall be so privileged shall arise into life eternal, *they* shall go forth from the abodes of an intermediate state of unhappiness into everlasting *destruction*, or *extinction of being*, —having their allotment in the final *death*, when death and hell shall be no more, but be cast into the lake of fire. On this supposition have proceeded different solemn discourses, purporting to be founded on the doctrines of sacred writ. Discourses of this complexion I have judged it unnecessary to select at large for this place; but merely to give the following short letter from a writer of deserved estimation among Dissenters from the Established Church in our own country.—The sermon of his on that subject, in his second volume, to which he alludes, I deem too long to be annexed: and as it is easily found in his works, I shall here content myself with referring to it.

W. M.

A letter to the Rev. SAMUEL CHANDLER, D.D.

REVEREND SIR, *Norwich, Sept.* 24, 1759.

HAVING heard you publicly assert some time ago, 'That the doctrine of *annihilation*, or, that the souls of wicked men shall be totally destroyed in the future state,' is utterly inconsistent with the Christian scheme; and as you did not at that time produce any argument of reason, or authority of scripture, to prove what you had asserted; it raised in me a curiosity to know by what proof you are able to support your assertion; in hope of receiving such satisfaction, as may be expected from a gen-

tleman of your known abilities, and study of the Christian revelation.

I am more ready to gratify my own curiosity in making you this public request, as I am persuaded that there is nothing more conducive to the discovery of truth, than for those who have studied the same subject, yet are of contrary opinions, to enter into a mutual disquisition of each other's arguments, and, with an amicable spirit of free enquiry, examine the strength of what may be alleged on both sides.

That I am of an opinion directly opposite to yours, you need not be informed: nor do I see the least reason to avoid either a public declaration, or defence, of my opinion. For as long as I remain fully convinced, as I am at present, that that doctrine which you asserted, more than once, to be absolutely inconsistent with the Christian scheme, is the *very doctrine of Christianity;* it will no affect me in the least, whether the opinion which I maintain, be thought old or new, common or singular, popular or unpopular.

That men who apply their minds to the study of religion and the Holy Scriptures, should be of different and even contrary opinions, is certainly no new thing in the Christian world. But that such should conspire, by a joint examination and friendly controversy, to investigate truths for themselves and others, in a subject concerning which they totally differ; is (I am sorry to say) something new and uncommon. But as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews exhorts them *to provoke one another* (as our translators have rendered it) *to love and good works;* so I do not doubt, but you, as well as every other reader of this pamphlet, will approve my conduct, in inviting and urging you in this public manner to a friendly discussion of so important a subject as this before us.

The importance of it will, I apprehend, be readily allowed; especially by those who have a real concern for the credit of the Christian religion: at least, it appears of so much consequence to me, that if it should be proved, that the final punishment threatened to wicked men in the New Testament, is not a total destruction, but an endless preservation in a state of misery and torment; this would, in my opinion, fix a greater odium upon Christianity, and raise a stronger objection to it, than all its adversaries have yet been able to produce: and I will venture to assert, that there are many persons in this nation, of no inconsiderable understanding, who would be strongly disposed to reject the New Testament as a divine revelation, if they were convinced that it contains such a doctrine.

For that any doctrine should be true, and have the real stamp of Divine authority, which ascribes to the Supreme Governor of the universe a conduct unworthy of any prince or governor on earth, and repugnant to our best conceptions of the measures and ends of good government, cannot easily be admitted by persons of a thoughtful and ingenuous mind. To overcome the antipathy of a good heart, and the remonstrance of a reasoning mind against it, will require an immense weight of external evidence.

A limitation of punishments is essential to all good government: to extend them beyond the limits of reason, or of law, which is the public reason, is one characteristic of tyranny. Where punishments are extended, or increased so far as the public safety and welfare require, and no further; *i. e.* where they are always limited and directed by a view to the happiness of the whole; there is good government: but where they are increased, either in degree, or duration, beyond what is requisite to that end; there is tyranny: where they are unlimited or infinite;

there is the greatest tyranny: for to punish a criminal in an excessive degree, and beyond what the ends of good government require, is as real injustice and cruelty, as to inflict a lesser degree of punishment upon an innocent person. For in both cases, it is equally inflicting misery, not to answer any necessary or useful end, but for the mere sake of increasing misery; which is the *worst end* that can be conceived.

There neither is, nor can be, any other difference between the best and the worst government possible, than that the former is administered with a view to produce and maintain the greatest virtue and happiness, and to prevent or extinguish, as much as possible, wickedness and misery; and the latter, with a view to prolong and increase wickedness and misery. Now whether the *endless* preservation of wicked spirits, in order to inflict upon them *infinite* miseries, be more consistent with the *former* or the *latter* kind of government, is not difficult to be determined. Their wickedness, or their misery, may be a reason in the mind of a good governor for destroying them: but the contrary, *viz.* preserving them for ever in a state of wickedness and misery, appears more conducive to the ends of the *worst* government than of the *best.*

To allege that human ignorance is so great, and our ideas of what is fittest and best so imperfect, that we can form no judgment of what the ends of divine government may require; and that therefore, for aught we know, *infinite* punishment, and the *endless* existence of some beings in the *greatest* misery, may be made subservient, by the incomprehensible wisdom of Providence, to the greatest virtue and happiness of the universe;—is only arguing for a *supposed possibility* against the greatest *probability;* and endeavouring, under colour of hu-

man ignorance, to screen a doctrine apparently most injurious to the character of the Supreme Being.

In human governments, extreme and lingering punishnents are a certain mark of barbarity, and a criterion by which to distinguish a *tyrant* from a *just and good prince*. In the best constituted governments punishments are the mildest, in the worst, the severest. For a perfect *tyranny* is supported solely by *fear;* but a just and legal government, by *better* principles and affections. And whether the *best* or the *worst* governments on earth are most *like* the *divine;* whether the greatest *tyrants*, or the most beneficent and *merciful princes*, most *resemble* the perfect *Governor of the universe;* no one will hesitate in deciding.

But, indeed, in all human governments, even the worst, *death* (which is *annihilation* in respect to human society) is the ultimate punishment: and all that is added by those judges who proceed to the extremest rigour, is an augmentation for a short space of time of the horrors and agonies preceding or attending the execution. And it is hardly to be conceived, that any prince, though absolute in power, tyrannical in disposition, and both injured and incensed to the highest degree, would not, in length of time, think justice satisfied, if not feel his own resentment satiated, by the extreme and lasting miseries of the criminal: and the idea of making these miseries everlasting, were this in his power, would be found too abhorrent to reason and humanity to be long entertained in a human breast.

How then can we think of imputing a procedure exceeding the severity of the greatest tyrant and of the worst of governments on earth, to that Being, whom we stile the best; *whose tender mercies are over all his works;* whom we ought to love with all our hearts, and to contemplate with

the greatest delight; and in whose designs and measures we ought to place an entire confidence? Why do we stile him *most merciful?* Why address him as THE FATHER OF MANKIND? A *father*, indeed, may punish a wicked and disobedient son: *i. e.* may withdraw his favour from him, may disinherit him, may inflict stripes or other penalties upon him; nay, acting as magistrate and judge, may put him to death. But what should we think of that *father*, who, acting in the capacity of a judge over his offending offspring, would not be satisfied (be their crimes ever so great) either with their total destruction, or their suffering for any limited duration, or the addition of the former to the latter; but who would rather judge them to *live for ever*, than to *perish for ever, in fire unquenchable?* How could such a judgment consist either with the equity of government, or the clemency of a judge? how much less with the disposition of a *parent?* How vain is it to compliment the ALMIGHTY with the titles of *most just* and *most merciful;* if at the same time we ascribe to Him a conduct, not only inconsistent with the *paternal* character, but irreconcilable to our clearest notions of *justice* as well as *mercy?*

Nothing is of greater importance to religion, than to preserve the character of the Supreme Being inviolate: for without this foundation it cannot be supported; but will be apt to degenerate into slavish superstition, or a blind and savage enthusiasm. Yet, perhaps, no character in the world has been more mistaken or traduced, and consequently suffered more reproach and injury from the tongues and pens of men: whilst not understanding the nature and end of government in general, nor having formed any clear and consistent notions of justice and mercy, or of that public utility, which ought always to be intended and answered by punishing as well

as by rewarding; they have erected, in their own imagination, a scheme of government, according to their own narrow, partial, arbitrary, or enthusiastic conceits; and have fondly imputed this scheme to the most sublime Being, whose wisdom and goodness are infinite, whose thoughts and designs excel those of the wisest and best of men, *as the heavens are above the earth.*

Nothing, then, can be more becoming those who are appointed to be ministers of religion, and guardians of its truth and purity, and to vindicate God's government of the world, and to rescue that most sublime and sacred character, which we should always contemplate with the highest veneration and affection, from those unworthy notions which men are apt to intermix with their belief of a Deity; and especially from those black calumnies, by which He is represented as no better in effect than the greatest tyrant, instead of being the most just, beneficent, and merciful governor. For the influence which religion has upon the dispositions and morals of mankind, will be useful, or hurtful, in proportion as their sentiments of the Divine nature and government are good or evil. The worst evils of superstition and enthusiasm have their source in an unjust or partial opinion of the Deity. Nor can the belief of his existence or Almighty power produce many good effects, separate from a belief of his perfect justice and goodness. A just esteem of the Deity, therefore, is that spring of true religion and virtue, which ought to be preserved, as much as possible, pure and untainted in the minds of men.

It is more curious and difficult, than necessary, to account for the propensity of mankind to receive and retain such ill impressions of the Deity, and his government of the world. Whether they may be ascribed to those fears and horrors, which

are apt sometimes, especially in some persons, to seize and wholly possess the imagination, and thereby disturb and overpower their reason:—Or, to their violent resentments against those who offend and injure them, which tempt them to avenge themselves in proportion to their own power, rather than to do justice in proportion to the offence; and hence lead them to imagine, that the greater power the person offended is possessed of, the greater punishment he will consequently inflict:—Or, whether they may be owing, in some instances, to the strength of any other passions:—So much is certain, that human passions and affections, either separate or united, have a great influence upon their understandings, and contribute both to form and confirm their particular sentiments of the character and disposition of the Supreme Being.

It may be equally difficult to trace out with any precision, how such opinions have actually arisen and spread in theworld; particularly this barbarous notion of a state of never-ending misery and torment. The heathen poets adopted the vulgar fables in regard to the different species of the infernal torments. And Virgil assigns a perpetual duration of misery to some criminals, "*Sedet æternumque sedebit infelix Theseus*;" though to others he is so favourable as to allow, in process of time, a release: so that this doctrine has a remarkable conformity to the Popish hell and purgatory. But it was the business of the poets to affect the imagination: and to this end they made the like use of the fabulous traditions of their times, as Shakespeare does of his witches and apparitions. These were the *poetarum and pictorum portenta*, which Cicero, as a philosopher, speaks of with so much contempt, as to say, "Who can be so senseless as to give any credit to them?"

Mahomet seems to adopt the doctrine of eternal torments in good earnest; and thunders it out, not only against criminals, but against all who do not receive his Koran. His language is, "They shall undergo the rigours of an infinite pain.—They shall never be eased in their torments.—They shall be eternally confined in the fire of hell.—They shall dwell there eternally.—God will change their burned skin into a new skin, that they may suffer the more.—He hath prepared hell for them, where they shall remain eternally.—The infidels shall be encompassed with flames of hell.—They shall have shirts of fire.—Boiling water shall flow in upon their heads:—The fire shall burn what is in their bellies, and shall roast their skin.—They shall be beaten with clubs of iron.—When they think to go out of this fire, they shall enter further into it.—They shall *not die* in those torments, and their torture shall never be assuaged.—They shall in vain implore succour of God.—They shall demand of the keeper of the fire, Will thy lord never deliver us from these pains?—He shall answer them, Ye shall abide there eternally.—They shall never get out of this fire, neither be able to repent.—Their pains shall be augmented, and pains upon pains."

It appears, then, that this doctrine of eternal torments is certainly a Mahometan, if not a heathen, doctrine. But whether it be a Jewish or a Christian doctrine remains a subject of inquiry.

I have not yet been able to discover any thing like it in the writings of the Old Testament; and am fully convinced that *those passages* in the New, which have been thought to imply it most strongly, do directly, and in the strongest manner, imply the contrary. And for proof of this, I beg leave to refer you to a discourse, now going to be published.[a]

[a] See the Author's Sermons, vol. ii.

If the expressions of *being thrown into a furnace of fire—cast into a lake of fire—into everlasting fire—into hell, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched* do not import a total destruction, or annihilation; I must confess myself to be utterly at a loss, and must beg your kind assistance in order to find out the meaning of them.

If I tell a man whose house is on fire, that that fire is *unquenchable;* the meaning is the same as if I told him, that his house would be entirely destroyed. If I tell a gardener, whose plants or the blossoms are infected by the worm, That he cannot kill that worm, or that *it will not die;* it is the same thing as if I told him, that his fruit will come to nothing, or his plants die. Or if a patient be afflicted with a distemper, which is supposed to proceed from worms, and he is told that *the worm will not die;* the meaning of the phrase must be, that the disease will end in the death of the patient. And if such phrases be considered as proverbial among the Jews, and that when any person fell into any distemper or calamity that would certainly end in destruction, it was usual for them to say, "That is a worm that will not die;" or, "That is a fire that will not be quenched;" the sense is perfectly intelligible: They meant that it was a lost case; that there was no possibility of preventing the destruction of the person, or thing, to which they applied the proverb.

Besides, there is something absurd and *contradictory* in the image made use of, if we suppose chaff, wood, or other useless materials, thrown into an unquenchable fire, and yet not to be consumed and destroyed in that fire; or a living creature cast into it, and yet preserved alive for ever in it: for throwing into the fire is always understood to be the most effectual way to *destroy* a thing: and the *less*

extinguishable the fire is, the *more certainly* will the subject thrown in be *consumed.* And the original term καῖακαιειν, properly translated, is to *burn up*, or *utterly consume by fire;* which is directly contrary to a being preserved in the fire. *Who shall* burn up *the chaff with unquenchable fire*, John iii. 12. The expression here is probably borrowed from Malachi iv. 1, *For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall* burn them up, *saith the* LORD *of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.*—Similar to this is the expression in the epistle to the Hebrews, *Our* GOD *is a* CONSUMING *fire;* καῖαναλισκον: which signifies, utterly destroying; the very reverse of preserving.—There is, indeed, so direct a contradiction between the idea of preserving any creature alive, and that of throwing it into a fire, a fire that cannot be extinguished; that if duly considered, it is amazing how men came to join so opposite ideas together, or imagine them to be consistent. This inconsistency Mahomet ridiculously attempts to reconcile, by saying, "That GOD will change their burned skin into a new skin, that they may suffer the more."

Fire is, indeed, an instrument of *torture*, as well as of *destruction.* But why men should think it more becoming the most just and merciful Governor of the world, to make it an instrument of *everlasting torment* to his offending creatures, rather than of their *everlasting destruction;* or why they should be disposed to take the words of scripture in a sense contradictory to reason, justice, and humanity, when they will not only admit of, but are *most naturally* understood in, a different sense, agreeable to justice and clemency; is to me inconceivable.

The subject is reducible, as far as the Christian revelation is concerned, to this single question: whether the afore-mentioned expressions are intended to convey to us the idea of everlasting torture, or of everlasting destruction, *i. e.* annihilation?—Perhaps some may be inclined to think, that they serve to convey ideas, both of torment, and of total destruction. With such persons (if there are any) I desire to have no controversy. Because on this supposition the torment or misery cannot be infinite: and it is only that Mahometan, Pagan, and (as I must confess it appears to me at present) most absurd, cruel anti-Christian, and diabolical doctrine of *infinite* or *never-ending* misery and torment, which I am opposing and endeavouring to eradicate: "*Quam excutere opinionem* (to use the words of Cicero) *mihimet volui radicitus.*"

That there are passages in the New Testament which imply, that the sentence of eternal death shall be executed upon criminals with circumstances of ignominy, horror, and pain, *proportionate* to their guilt, I readily allow and affirm: yet am not of opinion, that the figures of being *cast into unquenchable fire*, and the like, are intended to convey to us *any* idea of *torment*, but *solely* that of total *destruction*, or annihilation, or ceasing to exist. And the passage in the book of Revelations, where it is said, that *death and hell (i. e. Hades) shall be cast into the lake of fire*, seems to me decisive in this point. For certainly the meaning there is, not that *death and Hades* shall be *tormented*, (which is ridiculous) but that they shall be *abolished*.

But it is not my design, either to trouble you with a superfluous repetition of what hath been suggested in the discourse referred to, or to *exhaust* the subject; but only to represent to you in few words the view which I have of it at present; and to in-

treat your friendly assistance, in further explaining the subject, and either rectifying, or confirming my sentiments.

And give me leave to say, sir, that it is a subject worthy of your pen: that according as the doctrine of future punishment is differently explained and believed, it will very differently affect men's opinion of the Supreme Being: and that in a cause, in which the honour of God and the credit of the Christian revelation are so immediately concerned, you cannot find yourself unconcerned.

For my own part, I am persuaded, that the vulgar notion of eternal torments has been productive, not of virtue and happiness, but of wickedness and misery in the world, where it has been most seriously and steadily believed. However, consequences are not the subject of our enquiry, but the truth of the doctrine. The proper question is, what is the doctrine of our Saviour? When that is determined; if any man, after allowing the doctrine to be *his*, yet shall impute ill effects to it, or assert that it ought not to be preached or published, he pretends to be wiser than our Saviour, and is guilty of an arrogance inconsistent with his Christian profession.

That you bear a more free and noble mind than to be influenced by vulgar prejudices, or infected with an itch of popularity, or biassed by any mean considerations, I am most willing to believe; and therefore hope, that you will favour myself and others with a public explanation of your sentiments; and if you think proper to take pen in hand, cannot easily doubt of your doing ample justice to so important and interesting a subject.

I am, with sincere esteem,

Your's, &c.

SAMUEL BOURN.

So far this writer; who must be allowed, in this letter, and in his discourse alluded to, to have set the side of the subject which he has adopted in as strong points of view as it can be supposed to receive from human talents, and a firm belief of the literal import of some texts of sacred scripture. And for my own part I am free to confess, that were I obliged to receive his opinions, or to believe, or profess to believe, the endless future torment of innumerable beings, consequent upon the final judgment of an all-wise, all-powerful, and all-merciful Judge, who willeth not that any should finally die, and surely still less to suffer endless misery; I could not hesitate to receive this writer's more consistent faith. And I think I might confidently expect the same election from every serious sensible person, who should fully understand the terms, and the awful import of such an alternative! But whether such prevalence of faith might be happily seen or not, we have better, more bright, more consolatory doctrines, on which to rest our hopes in the present life, and for a glorious consummation in eternity! And if ever there were doctrines supremely consistent, and worthy to be received with all reverence and thanksgiving, let us believe that such are the doctrines of universal redemption, deliverance, and salvation! Here I would introduce a few further reflections of sundry religious writers, on this side of the momentous question—and then conclude this volume.

W. M.

Of that Death which the Scripture calls our LORD'*s last Enemy.*

IN order to decide the true import of these words, we should first examine what is here meant by the word *death*.

Now it is universally agreed, that death is the very *opposite* to life; and as life is said to consist in an enjoyment of those active powers which result from some peculiar union of our constituent principles; death is supposed to consist in a deprivation of the due use of such powers, occasioned by a loss of that peculiar union of our constituent principles: for doubtless life results not merely from an union, but from some *especial* kind of union, of our constituent principles, to us unknown.

However, as all true physical knowledge of those æonian matters vastly exceeds human penetration; at least as our disquisitions are intended to be rather scriptural than philosophical; and as the death intended by the scripture passage we are debating, is the second or latter death, declared in Rev. xx. 14, xxi. 8, to be in *the* (λιμνη τȣ πυρὸς) *lake of fire*, which is the last resource of all evil; we shall speak of death, and the efficacy of this last lake, as one and the same thing.

Of this lake it is said, that (Rev. xx. 14) *death and Hades were cast into it:* and these two words importing an account of things not so well known in our times, as they seem to have been to the church of St. John's days; a short explanation of them may be here needful to the opening of the above passage.

We are all agreed that every man consists of a soul and a body, and that a man's soul will not die till the day of his judgment is come, and his sentence is passed upon him; but that the bodies of men die before the day of their judgment comes, is our daily experience.

Now as the dead bodies of men are deposited in the grave, there to corrupt; their souls are conveyed into invisible regions, of which we can know nothing but by revelation.

Of these regions we have different names in scripture, because they are in place different from each other, being different residences suited to the different conditions of those who possess them.

Wherefore when we read of the prison, the abyss or bottomless pit, Abraham's paradise, the paradise of God, Jerusalem which is above, the temple of God, the sanctuary, the presence (or before the throne) of God; we understand by these terms places distinct and different from one another.

But since what we call death, as applied to the soul, will not befal any soul till after the *judiciary* sentence has been passed upon him, (that is, till after his day of judgment;) it will be asked, where then are the souls of those men who are not as yet called to judgment, during their expectation of it?

To this we answer, that the souls of some of these may be in the happy mansions of hades, which the Jews called sometimes paradise, and sometimes (that is, before our Saviour's death, till which time Abraham presided there) Abraham's bosom; that the souls of the wicked[t] will be, at least some of them,

[t] The scriptures suppose, that in the regions of hades there is a prison for the souls of some of those whose bodies are in the grave, they having not been as yet raised from the dead, or called to judgment. Compare Rev. xx. 3, 7; ix. 11; with Matt. v. 25; Is. xiv. 9—16; xxiv. 22; Ez. xxxi. 14—18; Job xxv. 5.

in the prison; but that the souls of the saved Christians will be in the paradise of GOD.[u]

For as we find a great variety of states attending the inhabitants of this our small globe, with regard to their persons, countries, subjections, possessions,

As therefore there is a paradise and gehenna in hades; so so is there also in hades a prison, and an abyss, prepared, it seems, rather for confinement than painful exercises, although not without wretchedness. Accordingly of the abyss we read, Luke viii. 31, *And they* (the devils) *besought him that he would not command them to* (leave the cheerful ærial regions of this world, and) *go out into the abyss.* For the abyss is their proper abode, being there (Jude 6) *reserved under darkness* [see Syriac] *by unknown chains to the judgment of the great day.*

u We read of two paradises in the scriptures, the first the paradise in hades; Luke xxiii. 43, *To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise, i. e.* in the paradise of Abraham, which was in hades, whither our Saviour's soul went when he died, (Acts ii. 31) *and the soul of the thief attended him:* therefore says Piscator, *fuit itaque dives quidem* εν ᾅδη, *sed fuit* εν ᾅδη *etiam* Lazarus, *disterminatis* ᾅδε *regionibus, nam & paradisus & gehenna sunt* εν ᾅδη.

The second paradise is represented to us as not in hades but in heaven, and is called (Rev. ii. 7) *the paradise of* GOD; *in the midst of which is the tree of life* which grows *in* (Rev. xxii. 2; Gal. iv. 25, 26) *the Jerusalem which is above, the mother of us all.*

The inhabitants of this city are (Heb. xii. 22, 23) *innumerable angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, and* GOD *the judge of all.*

It is of this our LORD speaks, when he says, (John xii. 26) *Where I am, there shall also my servant be:* and St. Paul, (2 Cor. v. 8) *We are willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord,* (Phil. i. 23) *having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better.* So John xvii. 24, *Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me.* And again, (Matt. viii. 11, 12) *And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,* (who at the resurrection of our LORD were to be a part of his retinue, and to go with him into the paradise above,

poverty, relations, dependencies, and the multiplying circumstances of all these; we may believe that there is likewise as great a variety diversifying the condition of the departed into other states of existence; and that the blessed are as variously blessed,

and be with him) *in the kingdom of heaven, but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*

The reality therefore seems to be this, viz. in the heavens is the paradise of God, which paradise is the celestial country; and Jerusalem which is above, is the city of this country; and in this city there is (in the present state of it) a temple, of which we read, Rev. iii. 12, *Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my* God, *and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of my* God, *and the name of the city of my* God, *which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my* God; *and I will write upon him my new name.*

Also in this temple there is a sanctuary, (Heb. viii. 2; ix. 8, 12) in which (Heb. ix. 12; xii. 24; xiii. 11) *is the blood of sprinkling, and* (Rev. viii. 3) *a golden altar of incense, and a throne, and a divine presence.*

It was *under, i. e.* at the foot of, or attending round about, *this altar* of incense, where St. John saw (Rev. vi. 9) *the souls of* the martyrs, crying for vengeance, and afterwards, *clothed with white robes before the throne,* singing a doxology to God. Rev. vii. 14—17, *These* (namely, the arrayed in white robes) *are they who came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of* God, *and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat; for the Lamb, who is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and* God *shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.*

This paradise is emphatically called the paradise of God, as being that genuine, natural paradise, which (though not opened till after our Lord's resurrection) is that prefigured by Adam's paradise.

Its manner and form of life and enjoyment was intended to be typified and exhibited to man, in the manner and form

and the wretched as variously wretched in an after life, as in the present.

It is true having very little from revelation to guide us in these inquiries, besides a few different names above-mentioned, viz. the *prison*, the *abyss*, *gehenna*, the *lake of fire*, the *paradise in hades*, the *paradise of* GOD, the *Jerusalem which is above*, &c.; terms which were probably indeed, among the apostolic Christians, significant of real knowledge; yet as they afford us, for want of the apostolic conceptions of Divine truths, very few and precarious notions of our future state, we can say very little of them, or by them of the life they relate to, with certainty.

However, we are assured that at the last great day, and after that judgment which shall conclude the scene of triumphant wickedness, all whoever are not then deemed worthy of the paradise of GOD, shall (together with their bodies, which death must then deliver up) go away into the lake of fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.[w]

So that the expression death and hades shall be cast into the lake, is a metonimy, as Grotius has

of Adam's primitive paradisaical life and enjoyment; where the sensations of body and mind were inseparable; and palpable gratifications (or such as resulted from touch) charmed the intellectual sensibility with knowledge, love, and delight in GOD.

[w] At the time which the scripture calls the last day, every evil, or every one unreconciled to GOD, who shall be found remaining in gehenna, shall likewise, together with all other inhabitants of hades, and every body that occupies the grave, from their several places and receptacles, be cast into the lake, the last doom of all wickedness: which a Roman Catholick writer describes as follows: *Cogita fornacem igneam, flammas conglobantem & ejaculantem quaquaversum: & in eo corpora damnatorum volutari, nuncque; ascendere, nuncque; descendere, nunc gyrari in omnem partem, idque; jugitur, nocte & die, in sæcula sæculorum*, &c. But the following of Gre-

justly commented upon this place,[x] and imports, that the accursed, together with all that belongs to them, whether living or dead, that is, whether in hades or in death, (namely, the death of the grave, or otherwise) shall become one aggregate mass of wickedness, doomed to a like catastrophe in this lake, reserved till now to be the last fate, the ultimate doom of all that is abominable.

It is farther observed of this lake, that its fire is charactered as *devouring* and *consuming;* so Heb. x. 27; xii. 29; 2 Pet. iii. 7; which suits with that *dissolution, consumption,* and *destruction,* so frequently denounced in scripture upon the incorrigible as their last end. So Phil. iii. 19, *whose end is* (απώλεια) *destruction,* (Rom. ix. 22) *vessels of wrath fitted* (εἰς ἀπώλειαν) *for destruction.* Psalm xxxvii. 20, *The wicked shall perish, the enemies of the* LORD *shall be as the fat of lambs, they shall consume away, into smoke shall they consume away.*[y] For the things of this world are the

gory's on Matt. viii. is rather a description of gehenna:—*Ejicientur in tenebras exteriores, ubi frigus erit intolerabile, ignis inextinguibilis, vermis immortalis, fætor intolerabilis, tenebræ palpabiles, flagella cædentium, horrida visio dæmonum, confusio peccatorum, nulla spes boni, nulla desperatio mali.*

[x] *Hic est,* says Grotius, *metonymia subjecti; vel continens pro contento, ut cœlum pro cœlicolis, terra pro iis qui terram incolunt: ita hoc loco mors,* i. e. *mortui; infernus,* i. e *ii qui erant in inferno.* And thus says our Saviour, (Luke x. 13) *Woe unto thee, Corazin, and unto thee, Bethsaida; i. e.* woe unto ye, the inhabitants of Corazin and Bethsaida: so (Acts viii. 14) *Samaria received the word of* GOD; *i. e.* the inhabitants of Samaria; Zech. xiv. 19, *and this shall be the punishment of Egypt; i.*e. of the people or inhabitants of Egypt.

[y] Let it not here be deemed an absurdity that the subjects of another life have material bodies: revelation gives us no reason to suppose that there are in nature creatures altogether immaterial; or that any of the inhabitants of the upper regions are void of matter. From the scripture accounts of them we

true patterns of the things of the world to come, as says our Milton:

> "Earth is the shadow of heaven, the things therein
> "Each other like, more than on earth is thought."

So that Satan, who seems to have been proof against the fires of gehenna, and to have exercised his government hitherto without suffering much himself from the elements of his kingdom, (for the regions of death are Satan's kingdom, he there sustains an imperial dignity and power, Heb. ii. 14, (το κρατος[2] εχωι τȣ θανατȣ) *Having the empire of*

gather only that the angels are spirits invisible from within, clothed with material, though very subtile vehicles, visible from without. These vehicles it may be presumed befit their inward nature, and that manifesting in them their hidden life, they become sociable, knowable, relative subsistencies. And being thus, doubtless they can enjoy certain bodily pleasures as well as we; and for the same reason, evil spirits can also suffer the miseries of the lake of fire.

Neither will our experience of bodily motion, or rather of bodily tardiness, afford (as some pretend) any solid argument against this hypothesis. Because he who has given to the rays of light a speed that can carry them two hundred thousand miles in a second, or the one-sixtieth of a minute, can likewise endue other bodies with a like swiftness by numberless means inconceivable to us: yea, and if he please, (supposing it even true that the velocity of a body proportions its subtilty) can give them a swiftness many hundred times exceeding that in a ray of light, by giving them a constitution many hundred times more subtile than have the minutest rays of sun or stars. Nor indeed is it at all improbable that this will be the case, since a Christian body will be quite pure after it has been sown in the earth, and requickened by the resurrective energies into its native vigour, rareness, and liberty; for then shall our bodies shine sublimed in glory, and *renewed in strength* in the realms of our God, regions of unbounded space and light.

[2] The word κρατος, here, is in the Syriac testament, sultna, which signifies a monarchical or imperial dignity and power, the same as the Turkish word sultan, which is derived from

death) will however find in this lake a fire equal to his firmest faculties, irresistible by the utmost efforts of corrupted nature, even by all whatsoever is not quickened with the principle of Christian life, Rev. xx. 6.

The Lake which is the second and most properly named Death, will, as our LORD'S *last Enemy, be ultimately disannulled.*

ALTHOUGH the second emphatical death (whose operations are to be in the lake of fire, the last disgraceful result of rebellion) will destroy horribly all the enemies of our LORD, yet as a destroyer it is itself stiled his enemy. 1 Cor. xv. 26, *The last enemy that is to be invalidated is death.* And being our LORD'S enemy, that is, his *last* enemy, it must itself likewise *lastly* cease to be, or as is our text, *be no more:* the force of which terms we shall therefore in the next place investigate by a comparison of similar passages.

the Syriac sultna. And thus we find it used in Rev. vi. 8; xii. 10; xiii. 2, 4, 5, 7, 12; xvii. 12, 13. So that the true meaning of this passage must be as it is exactly in the Syriac, *who holdeth the empire of death; i. e.* reigns as king in those regions, where death is produced, whether in the (קבר) grave or in gehenna.

In our countryman Bede, so learned in the opinions of the primitive writers, we read concerning devils as follows:—*Valde verisimile est in inferno dæmones habituros corpora ignea.* Whereby one would think it to have been the notion of his times, either that the wicked angels, being imperishable in gehenna, had their bodies assimilated into the nature of its fire; or that light, rendered gross by impurity, deforms and thickens into fire; in which case, either way, fire may be deemed satan's true element, and therefore in a degree supportable and consistent with his life.

This comparison is expedient, because the words of our text are directly applied to man only, (viz. Rev. xxi. 3, *Behold the tabernacle of* GOD *with man*, (ver. 4) *and* GOD *shall wipe away all tears from* THEIR *eyes)* and conclude, no otherwise than by consequence, a like restitution of all other fallen creatures. The arguing they afford by consequence as follows:

The death of the lake, which death is the second death, (into which all wicked men at the last dav of this world, called the great day of judgment, shall be cast[a]) will itself ultimately be no more, or cease to be;[b] therefore all wicked men shall ultimately be no more (or cease to be) its subjects.

But in the same lake at the same time will all the fallen creatures of GOD, together with fallen men, be likewise cast;[c] therefore a like inference is to be

a That this lake is the last resort of all wicked men, appears from Rev. xx. 13—15, *The sea, and death, and hades, delivered up their dead; and whatsoever was not found in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire,* (ὅτος εσιν ὁ δευτερος θανατος) this (death in the lake) is the second death, Matt. xxv. 41, *Depart from me ye cursed into æonian fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.*

b That the death in this lake, or the second death, is the death here spoken of as what shall be no more, is certain, because the first or former death had already for an whole period ceased: see Rev. xx. 14, 15, *And death and hades were cast into the lake*, &c. Yea, as this second death had been now for an whole period, ever since the last judgment, the only death subsisting, unless the death of the lake be intended in the words *there shall be no more death;* these words, tho' issuing from the throne, can mean nothing at all.

c The certainty of this will appear from Matt. xiii. 41, *The angels shall gather out of his kingdom* (παντα τὰ σκάνδαλα) *all that are offensive, and them* (τες men) *which do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire;* which, compared with Matt. xxv. 41, Rev. xx. 11, 15; proves to have been prepared for devils as well as men; and for theirs as well as them,

presumed for all other fallen creatures that are not men; namely, that when the death of the lake shall cease to be, these likewise shall be no longer the subjects of its violence.

That this second death found in the lake shall be no more, cannot mean less than its period is determined; and this determination of its period must be for the subsequent new scenes related, Rev. xxi. 1—4, viz. *The new heaven, and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem, descending from* GOD *out of heaven.*

Again, by the following compared texts the final ceasing of this second death, the death in the lake, will be yet farther confirmed.

We have lately mentioned one passage to this effect in 1 Cor. xv. 26, *The last enemy that shall be invalidated is death;* so that we shall proceed directly to a like passage which we read in Hos. xiii. 14, *O death, I will be thy* (דבר) *dissolution* or *perdition:* and this teaches us to understand the word invalidated (καταργεῖται) in the foregoing passage, as intending the real *perdition* and *dissolution* of, this last enemy of Christ, death.

It is true our English translators render this text in Hosea, *O death, I will be thy plagues;* upon which account some have fancied that the words intend that Christ will be the plague of the condemned; whereas the word (דבר) *dbr* signifies a *pestilence*, or *murrain*, or *pining away*, as we find (דבר) *dbr* translated in the septuagint by the words (θανατος) death, (απολλυμι) to destroy, (εκτήκω) to melt away.[d] According to which this passage means,

d So by (θανατος) Jer. xxi. 6, *Both man and beast shall die with a great* (דבר θανάτῳ) *pestilence.* Ezek. v. 12, *A third part of thee shall perish with* (דבר θανάτῳ) *wasting,* (Ezek. vii. 15) *famine, and* (דבר θανάτος) *pestilence shall*

O death, I will be thy dissolution; that is, by the working efficacy of my own death, and sacrifice, and resurrection, I will cause both thy works and thee *to be annihilated,* to vanish away, to be no more. Death, however, shall be our LORD's last surviving enemy, because of the use he has to make of him in his other enemies.

Is. xxv. 7, *And Jehovah will swallow up—the veil that is spread over all nations, and will swallow up death in triumphant perpetuity;* (לנצח בלע המות or to a victorious durance; see Is. xxv. 8, lvii. 16; Amos viii. 7; Lam. v. 20.) *And* (Adni Jehovah, or) *the Lord* GOD *will wipe away tears from all faces, and the disgrace of his people shall he take away from all the earth.* St. Paul renders this passage, 1 Cor. xv. 54, *And when this mortal* [*i. c.* this mortality both the (ψυχη) soul (compare ver. 43—50; 1 Cor. ii. 14; Rom. v. 14, viii. 9; James iii. 15; Jude xix; 1 Tim. vi. 16) and body, even all that is corruptible or mortal in us] *shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory:* whereby is intended that death, our LORD's last enemy, shall in the end be so abolished, as that no traces of it shall remain, even so much as to evidence its having been, as a thing that is swallowed up or devoured, becomes lost, and disappears for ever.

But all this, you say, proves not my point, because these passages are applicable to the elect only, or those whom no damnation shall affect. So that when I say from Rev. xxi. 4, That *there shall be no more death,* you demand, 2. But why must I

devour. By (ἀπολλυμι) 2 Chron. xxii. 10, *And he destroyed* (דבר ἀπωλεσε) *all the seed of the royal house.* By (ἐκτήκω) 1 Sam. i. 16) *For in the multitude of my meditations and indignation have I pined away* (דבר ἐκτέτηκα) *even till now.*

understand this as spoken of all, even the lost as well as the elect? I answer,

A. Because Christ is called without restriction (2 Tim. i. 10, Ὁ καταργησας τον θανατον) *He who invalidates*, or is in the very act of invalidating, *death*,[e] for these words import that he is now working the utter abolition and annihilation of its power and efficacy. And again, Hos. xiii. 14, *O death, I will be thy* (דבר) *consumption;* whereby is denoted that gradual decay and lessening of death's empire by delivering his subjects one after another out of his hold and tyranny; as first the elect in this life, who shall never taste death; 2dly, and in an after season the Jews; 3dly, in a still more distant period the nations, and so on:

Q. But this is all whim and conjecture; prove that the damned will ever be delivered from their death.

A. The damned are our LORD's enemies; yet they are not called his *last* enemies, for death is

[e] The word καταργεω signifies to invalidate, abolish, render effectless, disannul. So 1 Cor. vi. 13, GOD *shall invalidate* (or disannul, or abolish) *both the belly and meats;* by putting an end to their present offices. (Ver. xiii. 8) *He shall disannul prophesies, tongues, and knowledge,* or science; by causing them to cease, or which is the same, to be superseded by direct view of the LORD. Eph. ii. 15, *He shall disannul the law* by rendering it useless, &c.

This word is often used to answer the Hebrew word (בלע) to swallow up. So,

The Hebrew, בלע.	*The Greek*, καταργεω.
Ps. cvii. 27, *So that all their wisdom* (תהבלע) *is swallowed up.* - - - -	1 Cor. ii. 6, *Yet not the wisdom of the princes of this age which is invalidated.*
Is. xxv. 7, *He will swallow up the veil* (וכלע הלוט) *spread over all nations.* -	2 Cor. iii. 14, *Which veil is abolished in Christ* καταργειται.
Job ii. 3, *Although thou movedst me* (לבלעו) *to swallow him up*, or abolish him.	Rom. vi. 6, (Ἵνα καταργηθῇ) *that he may disannul*, or abolish the body of sin.

called his last enemy. Now all the LORD's enemies *shall be subordinated unto him* before *death shall be invalidated* or disannulled. But supposing the damned never to be otherwise than the LORD's enemies, how is death distinguished from all other enemies by being that enemy who shall last of all be invalidated or disannulled? At the time when death shall be disannulled, the LORD will have no other enemy than death to disannul; but the LORD will have other enemies than death long after his accomplishment of the number of the elect, therefore the time of death's disannulling shall not be immediately upon the accomplishing the number of the elect;[f] and therefore neither do the terms *disannul death* respect death's tyranny over the elect, but his tyranny over the damned.

The elect, who are our LORD's first enemies to be subordinated, shall first be rescued and safe from the influence of death; afterwards the damned (who are the LORD's next enemies to be subordinated) shall also in the next period be rescued; and then lastly death himself shall be disannulled. But death it is said shall be disannulled, as the LORD's last enemy, *i. e.* not till (1 Cor. xv. 27) *all* other *things* (*i. e.* persons, and consequently the damned) *shall be subordinated* to Christ.

2. But by death is meant those that are damned, and not any imaginary being to succeed them as the final subject of restitution.

A. Yet supposing this, the consequence is still the same, for if by death be meant the damned, then

f That death shall not be disannulled immediately upon the accomplishment of the number of the elect, is also evident, because the damned are sentenced to death in the lake as their ultimate fate; Rev. xx. 14, *This* (death in the lake) *is the second death;* but this sentence will not be passed till the number of the elect is accomplished, and secure in those arms from whence no creature can pluck them.

are the damned they, who, 1 Cor. xv. 26, *as our* LORD'S *last enemy shall be disannulled.* But these (1 Cor. xv. 25, 28) shall likewise be *subordinated;* and thus the word *disannulled* and *subordinated* will signify the same thing.

Their enmity will be disannulled, and thereby themselves become subordinated; and so also will they be capable to join party with the universal body, of whom, says St. John in Rev. v. 13, *Every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I, saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sits upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, to the æons of the æons.*

Whether by death therefore be meant satan lord of death, or whether that death which is to be found in the lake, or whether the collected multitude of dead souls; still it will follow, that as death shall be disannulled, his efficacy as an enemy *shall cease,* or, as the prophet expresses it, (Is. xxv. 7) *Jehovah will swallow up in the mountain* (otherwise called Zion, upon which the temple stood) *the face of the covering cast over* (or the covering film which covers, and so darkens the eyes of) *all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations: he will swallow up death to a prevailing perseverance,* (לנצח) *i. e.* to all perpetuity. (Compare 1 Cor. xv. 25—28, Heb. ii. 8.)

So then, until to the words DEATH SHALL BE NO MORE, you shall have found some other meaning than that "*death* shall continue to exist no longer;" I think it ought to be a doubt with you that death is immortal, and that the truly-dead shall never die.

STONEHOUSE.

The following concluding sentiments are extracted from a pamphlet lately published, on the Scripture Doctrine of *Universal Redemption*, by JOHN SIMPSON, M.A. a minister of the Gospel, and one of the most amiable of men. The work itself evinces an intimate acquaintance with the subject, which he has treated with that learning, accuracy, clearness of arrangement, and seriousness, which, while they do him the highest credit as a scholar, must render him equally estimable as a Christian.—And I have pleasure in strongly recommending the tract as eminently worthy of the professed Christian's perusal.

IN natural philosophy, that hypothesis which explains and accounts for acknowledged facts with the greatest clearness, and the fewest difficulties, ought to be adopted. If it solve the several phenomena simply and easily, and there is no other hypothesis but what is attended with absurdities and contradictions; there is a moral certainty that it is the true one. Now this rule, I apprehend, fully applies to the notions which we have endeavoured to establish relative to the duration, both of the punishment of the wicked, and of the happiness of the righteous, in the life after this.

Respecting the future punishment of sinners the idea of corrective chastisement accords with *all* our best sentiments of the attributes, providence, and governnent of the Supreme Being, and with *every* expression that is used by those whom He has commissioned to impart his will concerning their state in the world to come. The idea of endless happiness as the recompence of the righteous is also agreeable to the infinite power, wisdom, and good-

ness of the Most High; affords a satisfactory explanation of *all* his proceedings towards them in this world; and *perfectly coincides* with *every* intimation, and more direct promise, that He has given in Scripture, relative to their reward in the succeeding state. These ideas of future rewards and punishments reconcile, in the easiest and completest manner, *all* the seeming irregularities of the divine government in the present life, by manifesting, that this state is only preparatory to another, in which the wise and benevolent plan of the ALMIGHTY will be completed, and its perfection be fully displayed. They also *remove* a great *difficulty* with regard to the final happiness of the good, which we cannot conceive to be, at any period of it, unalloyed, if many, for whom they had a tender affection in this world, be doomed either to eternal death, to extinction of being, or to never-ceasing torment. The notions of future annihilation, of everlasting death, or of endless pain, as the recompence of vice in this life, and of finite happiness as the reward of the good, do, however, *none* of them accord, either with *all* the expressions of Scripture relative to a future state, or with our *purest* and most *exalted* sentiments of the attributes and proceedings of the supreme Creator and Governor of the universe.

From the whole of our premises, therefore, it appears to be the doctrine of the New Testament, and agreeable to the best natural conceptions we can form of the Most High, and of his proceedings, that in the next world the righteous shall enter upon a state of felicity, to which there will be no end: and that the wicked, after enduring painful chastisement, by which their habits will be reformed, and their minds fitted for pure and spiritual enjoyment, shall undergo a second death, and finally be restored to life and happiness.

Can we forbear, then, to express our gratitude for that supremely-abundant goodness which gave assurance to man, of unmixed and never-ceasing happiness, as the reward of sincere and habitual, though frail and imperfect, obedience to his commands, during only the short trial of this frail and transitory life? Commands which require nothing but what is necessary to fit a rational being for the highest and most perfect enjoyment to all eternity?

With what unspeakable satisfaction and thankfulness must the well-disposed mind contemplate the infinite wisdom and benignity of the Great Being, who, from the beginning, planned and pursued the sublimely-benevolent scheme of training the human race by all the joys and sorrows, and various vicissitudes of this world, for a state of endless and undefiled happiness, of rescuing even the most obstinately wicked, the greatest enemies of God, of their own and of the general happiness, from the dreadful effects of vicious propensities, and of finally preparing them for the unalloyed delights of piety, benevolence, and all virtue. How kind and merciful a contrivance to save them, though they can escape only as by fire, rather than cast them off for ever, and banish them eternally from his blissful presence! When the sinner, by not improving the milder corrections of his heavenly Father in this world, renders severer anguish necessary to change his temper and conduct in the future life, the mind that ponders the whole of this grand scheme of Divine government, fixes upon the final everlasting result, and dwells with delight upon the period when every untoward and perverse habit shall be rectified, and every disposition attuned to those enjoyments which none can share but the pure in heart. Every thing temporary that prepares for this divine consummation, is viewed only as a necessary step towards the

attainment of unceasing happiness, and is absorbed in the idea of the complete and endless felicity in which it terminates. Even necessary corrective pain is considered only as the wise and kind discipline of a parent to secure the solid and durable future happiness of his offspring. How grateful the thought, that multitudes of deluded mortals in this life, who are led astray by the deceitfulness of sin; who mix with their vices many amiable qualities which become a snare to others; who, while they promise themselves and their companions liberty and pleasure, are yet the slaves of corruption and wickedness, which even now pierce them through with many sorrows; how reviving, to be assured that a method of deliverance will be conducted by Him who suffered death for *every* man, to recover even these vessels of wrath, though by grievous suffering and a second death, to a renovation of their minds, that will fit and dispose them to become willing subjects of that kingdom of righteousness, which our LORD has declared he will firmly establish, by vanquishing and destroying all opposite rule and authority of sin and death, by subduing every enemy to truth, order, purity, and happiness.

If in heaven there be joy over *one* sinner who repenteth, (Luke xv. 7) what an inconceivable multiplication of this joy must there be, at the restoration of millions of mankind from the death of sin to a life of undefiled and unceasing enjoyment? Can any one who sympathizes with the state of every human being refrain from rejoicing at the prospect of such a wide diffusion of felicity? The more he has dreaded the extension of misery to the unspeakable numbers who leave this world unfitted for the relish of pure and virtuous pleasures, the more gladly will he contemplate that awful, grand, and animating scene, when Jesus, having accomplished

the extensively-benevolent purposes of his divine commission, shall deliver up his kingdom and power to the Father, who then will be all in all. The perfection of his power, wisdom, and goodness, in his general government of the world, and in the formation and completion, by his honoured missionaries, of the great scheme for the final everlasting salvation and happiness of his whole family on earth, will then be clearly displayed, and be gratefully acknowledged by all. And the myriads of his rational creatures that have succeeded each other since the first formation of the world, being all restored to purity and happiness, will rejoice to promote the unalloyed felicity of each other, to the widest limits of their respective powers, and to increase in resemblance to perfection itself throughout the endless ages of eternity.

Glorious and delightful consummation! O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and goodness of GOD! How inexpressibly sublime the close of such a scheme so worthy of its kind and all-perfect Contriver, so suitable to the character of the gentle and benevolent Messenger of the great design, the Father of the age, the Prince of peace: Is. ix. 5. Well might the prophet exclaim, *Break forth into joy, exult together, for Jehovah will comfort his people, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of* GOD: Is. lii. 9, 10. Well might the Evangelist call the instructions of Jesus, the glad tidings of his kingdom: Matt. iv. 23. Well might an angel be represented as swiftly descending from heaven to proclaim these everlasting glad tidings to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people that dwell on the face of the earth! Rev. xiv. 6.

Cruttwell, Printer, St. James's-Street, Bath.

A

GENERAL EPISTLE

OF

Brotherly Admonition and Counsel,

TO THE PEOPLE

CALLED

QUAKERS,

IN

GREAT BRITAIN, IRELAND, AND AMERICA.

ISSUED AT THE TIME OF THE YEARLY MEETING IN LONDON,

Anno 1803,

On Behalf of sundry Brethren concerned for the religious Improvement of that Society.

BY THEOPHILUS FREEMAN.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY W. SPILSBURY, SNOWHILL,

FOR J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1803.

[*Price Eight-pence.*]

GENERAL EPISTLE,

&c. &c.

Dearly-beloved Friends:

UNDER an influence far better than that of any annual custom, we address you on this occasion; and from a lively sensation of that antient love, that first gathered the Christian Churches out of the spirit of this world, which lay, and still lieth in wickedness, formality and superstition, we sincerely salute you; wishing you, also, an increase of spiritual health and wisdom, from God the Father, through the Holy Spirit, and the dispensation of Jesus Christ, the anointed Saviour of men! . . . . . And although we believe there never was a state of the professed Christian world, when serious brotherly exhortations to piety and virtue were not necessary, we believe the present times call aloud for the exercise of such admonitions. The moral disorder which prevails through the various ranks and descriptions of mankind, professing the Christian name, is sorrowfully great; and when we consider this subject in the aggregate, it becomes a cause of comparative thankfulness, that there is yet a leaven of gospel righteousness prevalent in various societies. . . . May it become more abundantly so in *ours*, which has been long remarkable for an high and holy profession!

But, dearly-beloved brethren, it is with inexpressible concern, that we behold the declension of numbers, and of true spiritual life, in our Society at large; and that, among the different causes of such declension, are included an obvious deviation from antient simplicity of faith, the fruit, we fear,

of too easily yielding to mere winds of doctrine, and taking for doctrine the traditions and commandments of men! In a full belief of that divine call and assistance, which formerly attended many of our predecessors, we wish to excite your recollection of past examples, and to engage your attention to the *genuine* concerns of the Christian religion.

We can have no doubt, but that the divine goodwill of our Heavenly Father has been uniformly the same, through all ages, and towards all generations of men, that they should reverently receive, as their greatest benefit, the government of his glorious attributes, and so live as to die in his favour. Yet may his dispensations of light and truth have varied, according to his unerring and infinite wisdom. Under this general view of divine providential government, we would refer you to the most antient and sacred records, respecting the first laws and commandments of God, to the people of Israel; and to illustrations of the spirit of those laws and commandments, in after-ages, by the inspired prophets,—those preachers of faith and righteousness, who largely received the *lively oracles* to give unto the people. In those records, the Almighty is uniformly represented as *one God*; that he is alpha and omega, the first and the last; the creator and preserver of all things; infinite in power, wisdom, and love; glorious in holiness; delighting in works of mercy, loving-kindness, and truth; slow to anger, and of great mercy; immutable and eternal in his nature! And that in the solemn faith of these attributes, men, universally, were bound to adore him, and to regulate their conduct as in his presence. In all the transgressions and rebellions of mankind, against the spirit and substance of these revealed doctrines, the displeasure of the Almighty was proclaimed, as resting upon impenitent sinners: such were ever the objects of his righteous judgments; while the children of obedience were ever entitled

to place a substantial and sure trust in the divine acceptance and peace! An abundant counter-balance was thus proclaimed, for all the troubles and sufferings incident to a state of human infirmity: and it is not to be doubted, that to many good men, under the legal dispensation, were afforded satisfactory evidences of immortality and eternal life. But as an increase of light and glory in the divine œconomy, imply no want of wisdom or goodness in the adorable fountain of divine perfection, it behoves us to believe, with all thankfulness, admiration and reverence, that such *progressive* revelation was the sublime and gracious fact. The dispensation of the gospel of Jesus Christ, was prophetically foreknown; and the light, liberty, and blessed fulness thereof, were, in various ways, described under the most undoubted sanctions of inspiration. Life and immortality were to be still more abundantly brought to light by the gospel. By that "glorious "gospel of the blessed God," through Jesus Christ his son, a new and everlasting dispensation was fore-ordained, for the highest instruction and comfort of mankind; and the nations were to be laid under increasing obligations to the works of righteousness and universal peace! Under the light of this most merciful dispensation, the nature of the kingdom of Heaven itself was to be more fully revealed; and its privileges and laws of love to be more completely manifested. The sensual and wrathful propensities of men, usurping the most unhappy dominion, were to become powerfully corrected by the influence of a more divine manifestation; by the reception and spreading abroad of that light and truth which had been fore-ordained to come by Jesus Christ. By such provision the broken harmony of a disordered system was to become more than restored; it was to become the means of increasing enjoyment and blessedness, to

all who would receive the gracious boon, from generation to generation. Individual and general blessedness were to adorn and dignify human society, on the most simple and sublime principles: the sacred result of the whole was to stand in this, "glory to God in the highest,—peace on earth,—"good-will to men."

This new and enlarged order of light and love, was thus to take place in the world, by privileges more gloriously revealed; but not by virtue of any *change* in the divine relationship of the Almighty to men, as our eternal common father: not accompanied by any *altered* proclamation of his sublime existence, as the one, indivisible, and eternal God. Nothing of the nature of any *triune* existence, which would have been incompatible with the faith most antiently revealed and held sacred, was ever divinely taught, in connexion with the introduction of Christianity. When in the fullness of time, which had been foretold, the Lord Jesus, the son of God, the nature of whose existence in a super-eminent manner flowed out of the divine *will* of the Father, came into the world as his heavenly messenger, the *modal* manifestation of that divine will became fulfilled and established in him. The circumstances accompanying the appearance of Christ, including the evidence of his miracles, fully attested his Messiahship, and stamped the divinity of his mission. The doctrines he preached corresponded with his character, as the great *prophet* which was to come, most sublimely commissioned, the divine *messenger* and *mediator* of an everlasting covenant. His death and final sacrifice for the sins of transgressors, whereby the law of sacrifices was ended and abolished; his resurrection and ascension into Heaven; all concur to fix the faith of serious men in the divinity of his dispensation. Happy are

all those who consistently devote themselves to the study and benefits of this transcendant theme!

Such, we have no doubt, were, generally speaking, our worthy forefathers; such the subjects of their solemn meditation, of their mental assent, and doctrinal labours: although it is not necessary for us to believe, that in *all* points of faith, and *all* consequent practice, they were perfect, and infallibly right. They might not be clear of opposing their zeal for truth, to objects which it was not in their province, as peaceable disciples of Jesus, to controul or regulate, any farther than, according to *his* example, by *teaching* and *persuasion*. Under this general idea, may be considered their mode of opposing the laws of the land, in the complicated system of *tithes*; a system, wherein it has often been shewn that they could not have a justifiable right of carving and appropriating entirely for themselves, without regard to the existence of national laws, by which the different interests had been *legally* settled. They might with full propriety, as may we, state the progressive corruption of the institution of tithes, as also its incompatibility with genuine Christianity; and *remonstrate* and *plead*, for the Christian fitness of a reformation. But from the analogy of their own practice, in paying on a principle of obedience to the powers that be, other legal taxes, however anti-christian in their objects and use, as well as from the non-existence of any positive example or precept of Christ, to the contrary, it is clear to us they could not consistently do more than *state principles*, and *plead for reformation*. Their assumed right of *withholding* legal dues from others, and their rules of coercion, or power of expulsion from membership among themselves, on this subject, were never plainly shewn to be of Christian authority; and the inferences from other doctrines, which have been substituted for proofs, can never be ex-

pected to carry the force of *evidence*, to serious and unprejudiced enquirers. The continuance of that assumed authority in the church, has been a vexatious article, an unhappy source of contention, *ever since*; and so long as it remains, will be found so. As there is no absolute perfection in any system beneath the sun, so this is to be considered as a speculative imperfection in ours, and as a formal standing spot in our feasts of charity. But though our ancestors be allowed to have stepped in this, and perhaps in a very few other instances, beyond the line of Christian charity, and even of Christian liberty; it does not follow that, in other more sacred matters of faith, they were equally impeachable. We can bear an ample and satisfactory testimony to the contrary:—in most things they have set us a worthy and edifying example.

They taught and exemplified the excellence of a life of piety and spiritual communion with God; and considered it as the vital substance of religion. They strongly held the scriptural doctrine of the *unity of God*, in opposition to the scholastic corruptions of it, by synods, counsels, and speculative schoolmen. They generally disbelieved a *Trinity* of persons or essences, substances or subsistences, in the sacred Godhead. The term *Trinity*, was by them fully rejected: its indefinite import, they would not be incumbered with; but considered it as an innovation on scripture simplicity: and finding in scripture no foundation for the notion of a plurality of divine *hypostaces*; they held no belief in doctrines arbitrarily deduced from that notion. Hence, they could not admit an assumed doctrine of the *co-eternity* and *co-equality* of Jesus Christ the Son, with the Almighty and eternal Father. They appear to have acknowledged him with unfeigned reverence in all his offices, as the son, and sent of the Father, and the anointed instrumental Saviour

of the world. But as they searched the scriptures, and professed to believe in these matters, according to the evidence of scripture verity; they found the salvation of all penitent sinners virtually provided for, on the broad immutable foundation of the mercy of God,—not only the eternal Father of all men, but "the God and Father of our Lord "Jesus Christ" himself. His mercy, being eternally full and perfect, could receive *no increase*, *no change*, from any possible operation, exterior to his own omniscient and eternal mind. Hence also, the ambiguous doctrines of a necessary *vicarious atonement*, and of *plenary satisfaction*, whereby the Almighty God has been represented as literally *embarrassed* in the voluntary exercise of his attributes, and *influenced by another*,—were to our antient Friends equally unscriptural and anti-christian. The Son of God, however dignified by *priority* of existence to all created beings, and by *mediatorial* design, was truly and properly only a *mediator*, though of a better and more perfect covenant, than that which was revealed under the law: and the constitution of his *mediatorship* was, for the benefit of men, according to the complete eternal purpose of the Father, without whom, as sacred records, in various concurrent phrases, state the testimony of Christ himself, *he could do nothing!* The question *why* this sublime *instrumentality*, for the good of the human race, became an institution of Heaven, it becomes us not, even mentally, to agitate; but thankfully to receive, as a part of the inscrutable order of divine wisdom and mercy. As such a divinely dignified messenger of God, (who laid down his life in his mediatorial offices) the son was to be received and honoured, by all whose affections became purified and redeemed; they are bound to honour him as *truly* as they honour the Father, the original immutable fountain of all grace and

perfection: all the spiritual members of the true Church are so bound to honour him, in that he remains to be the divine messenger of the covenant, the one mediator between God and man, and the comforter of the universal Church. This honour he will not fail to receive from all Christians, who happily experience his purifying agency, and thereby that redemption from iniquity which renders them acceptable before God. There is, consequently, no necessity for disputations and censures among Christians, about the precise degree of that divinity of character in which the Son is to be honoured: the subject itself being superior to a revealed standard, the duty becomes dischargeable by the sincere and thankful reverence of the heart, of which we inadequate mortals can never take full cognizance one for another.

In full agreement with these sentiments, we presume to have been those of most of our first Friends; in full agreement with them are those of the most studious, sober, and exemplary Christians of other societies at this day. But, whether it be proveable or not, that such was the substance of the faith of our antient Friends, it is not essential to determine.

It is to be regretted, and we really regret the fact, that of late there have been held forth, by sundry zealous persons among Friends, as a profession proper for the Society, doctrines of unrevealed faith, respecting the divine nature and attributes, which must mar the Society's harmony: doctrines which have their beginning and progress in unprofitable speculation; doctrines which not only lead to "doubtful disputation," but which make a near approach, however unintended, to *Athanasian* enormities:—for we cannot but consider as such the tolerated public assertions of sundry persons at different times and places, that our Lord

Jesus, the Son and sent of the Father, is himself the very God who sent him,—that he is *co-equal* and *co-eternal*:—that unless men so believe of the Son's character, they must die in their sins, and where Christ is gone they can never come; plainly intimating that "they must perish everlastingly."—And here we cannot but warn all against that extreme presumption of holding out the *literal* threatenings of *everlasting burnings*,—and *endless torments*,—even as consequent upon sinful works, much more so as to what may be reasonably deemed erroneous faith:—but we entreat the more learned to remember, and that the unlearned be admonished, that the *original* words and phrases of scripture, on which *infinite* punishments are supposed to be founded, *do not* necessarily bind to an infinite sense; but commonly imply the *contrary!* And though our limits, on this occasion, will not admit of a full discussion of this awful subject, let the above *warranted* assertion be received as a salutary check against all dreadful presumption in this matter. And let all be content to teach as doctrine, according to scripture wisdom, that the Judge of the whole earth, in awfully punishing, according to his infinite purity and justice, all iniquity, transgression, and sin, will not determine inconsistently with his infinite mercy; and will most assuredly do right. The bold unqualified denunciation of *infinite torments*, in the manner we often hear, may be the effects of ignorance, inconsideration, and intemperate zeal for truth; but they indicate a state of mind unreplenished by the spirit of the gospel, and are an intolerable slander on the divine attributes!

Such doctrines as we are now concerned to deprecate, are, in themselves, incapable of any real proof; but stand directly opposed to what we most certainly learn from scripture-revelation. They do worse than gender strife about words; they open a

wide door to animosities of ignorance and hardness of heart, instead of enforcing those true devotional exercises of the mind, which render the Christian religion amiable and advantageous. We are not called, beloved brethren, to the public discussion of Athanasian subtleties; but to worship the *one* true God in spirit and in truth, in singleness of heart, as in his immediate presence. And we can only act consistently with our religious call and profession, by a fervent devotion towards that being who, though invisible and incomprehensible, is ever present with his people—one revealed object of their adoration—one revealed and unchangeable source of all consolation and hope! Here the Lord Jesus, in his *mediatorial* office, is beneficially known and acknowledged, as the holy prevalent high priest; but the great object of the soul's devotion is the *one* infinite and eternal God. Our system of silently waiting upon *him* in our religious assemblies (however liable to be too much rested in, as an outward form of godliness), is peculiarly suitable to these ideas of his omnipotence and omnipresence, and the sacred unity of his nature. And as many as give proof of their sincerity, in this great article of our religious economy, in addition to the evidence of moral rectitude, are to be properly considered as our brethren, with all tenderness and fraternal affection; notwithstanding some possible imperfections and errors of judgment, which others may think themselves free from. The apostolical injunction is indispensible, "let brotherly love continue." We cannot but admonish the society generally, and all censorious spirits particularly, in this wholesome language of the Apostle, Jam. iii. 5. "Behold how great a "matter a little fire kindleth!" In this part of our admonitions, we wish to allude to some instances which have lately appeared, particularly in an anonymous writer, who, with a readiness too much

resembling pharisaical conceit and arrogance, would, as at one breath, *unchristianize* their brethren; and that for sincerely thinking, in some few doubtful points, differently from their own *professed orthodoxy:* points of opinion, on which, save in a cordial agreement to differ, it may not be essential to agree at all; points about which a difference of judgment may ever subsist, without the least injury to christian affections on either side, if men, as Christians, could lay aside the heat and prejudices of their own spirits. The history of particular churches and religious connexions, furnishes but too lamentable proofs of the evil we now regret:—when but a little of the "strange fire," unfit for the altar of the God of Peace, is dispersed abroad in the tabernacle, how widely and destructively has it been seen to spread! The great beauty of social religion has been sometimes nearly lost in the flame, and the most uncharitable and rancorous passions, even between former near friends, have taken place. The weak and inexperienced have been generally found among the foremost in censure, and in the most intemperate judgment. We therefore warn all who, from whatever causes, occupy the fore ranks of the Society, to be on their guard against countenancing the dangerous strife of orthodoxy, in all matters of uncertain and speculative faith. But, in the words of the aforesaid Apostle, "Who is a wise man and "endued with knowledge amongst you? Let him "shew, out of a good conversation, his works with "meekness of wisdom."—Jam. iii. 13.

From a painful view of the diminished state of the Society, under our name, and the great ignorance of principles which we fear prevails, we have been led to lament the want of sound spiritual qualification, in too many of those who move in the line of the Gospel among us: the number of able ministers is become few indeed! This state of

things is not without a cause. The great importance to our youth of religious and edifying instruction, should be considered as a fundamental concern. The animating influence of a lively Christian ministry, on the tender and teachable mind, has been happily felt among our Friends in times past, and much of the former lively ardour of the Society was deducible therefrom. The nature and value of the cause in which the instruments of such good were encouraged to move, remain undiminished; neither have we reason to believe that the divine Being is less graciously disposed than formerly to sanction a true gospel ministry: and in making the minister, by the call of his love, he does not unmake the man; nor does he require a neglect of those natural talents which he himself has given; but would graciously sanctify the cultivated powers and acquired knowledge of the human mind. He must be worthily considered as delighting in the improvement of religious affections, by the fervent offices of every qualified branch of his family: his blessing would most undoubtedly attend them. But it appears to us that the existing defect is largely chargeable on the general prevalence of a worldly spirit, of which the influence debases and corrupts the mind, and thereby disqualifies for the reception of spiritual gifts, and the genuine impressions of gospel benevolence.

Again, the narrow and chilling influences of that formal official mastery, called *Eldership*, as now too generally exercised, appears to us to be lamentable. Where the official censors of a church, and especially of its ministry, are extensively unimpressed with the liberality of the gospel spirit, the effects must often be found, in correspondent obstructions. When the appointed superintendants of a house are ill-informed, dull, or censorious, there will be dullness, depression, and revolting in the household.

The most capable instruments, adapted to generous and christian exertions for the spiritual welfare and sublime instruction of the body, will feel the disadvantage: the narrow sectarian spirit, in petty pleaders for forms and implicit faith, will not only be preferred before them, but chiefly countenanced, which in our Society, we fear, has been sorrowfully the case. Little that is free, sublime, and excellent, can be expected to flourish under such impediments. We speak thus plainly, brethren, because we have largely seen the causes and effects in these matters; and because we would gladly excite that more general attention which, by the blessing of Providence, on the right use of our endeavours, may lead to renovation. From the aforesaid causes, and the prejudices which they naturally diffuse in the general body, may we not fully account for the present dwarfish state of our public ministry? A state of declension which seems fast approaching to insensibility of true gospel dignity, if not unto death itself!

We are aware of the value of our original principle, of the gospel liberty of *female* ministry; nor would we undervalue the real gifts and graces of any of our sisters, wherever found; and especially wherever they might become useful substitutes for more suitable, more naturally to be expected, and more powerful instruments in the gospel service. Instances are not wanting of some truly respectable female ministers, who have done honour to the sacred profession: the habitual piety and good-will of many amiable women among us, as well as among other religious bodies, are abundantly conspicuous; and they furnish bright and most valuable examples in a Christian society. But a predominant feeble female ministry is not according to the primitive apostolical order in the Christian Church: few and extraordinary were the instances of the primitive call of women to the public ministerial

service: and comparatively few, we sincerely think, would really be found so called at this day, and those few abundantly more useful than the majority now appear, were the cause of religious truth, and the consolations of the gospel, more fully enforced by a better system of religious education among our young men: a system in which religious studies, readings, and audible exercises, should bear a more important and sacred part. This would naturally operate as a *preparative* to the gospel influence on many, whose talents and good affections are now sunk in the mass of worldly objects, and lost from the sanctuary!

The declension in our number of schools for classical education, and the consequent production of more qualified scholars, has been lately regretted by an able writer, in a brief but valuable tract addressed to the Society. This tract is worthy of much regard. But merely classical education, though certainly useful in expanding the capacity for clear and correct reasoning, and still more for qualifying to read and understand the Scriptures in their original languages, is not the most important part of a strictly religious education. The line of instruction by which most of the christian and apostolical spirit may be infused into the youthful mind, is still more desirable for the bulk of the Society. And though, for the middle ranks, those branches which more particularly qualify for useful business, as writing, accounts, and practical mathematics, should not be neglected, yet scriptural digests and histories, theological arrangements, and especially devotional tracts and discourses, in which our language abounds, from the elegant pens of religious laymen as well as pastors of churches, might become excellent aids. The admirable Apology of Robert Barclay, and some others of our own doctrinal writers, would, of course, be included. Such works, with " frequent reading the

"Holy Scriptures" in suitable portions, at particular times, would be likely to produce a general happy effect on the minds of our youth, of which there is now but little appearance. And out of the number of such students, we might reasonably expect many able men to grow up, skilled in the best wisdom, for the regulation of families, and the edification of the Church, "rightly dividing the word of "truth." For such extensive views, the laudable establishment at *Ackworth*, chiefly for poor children, cannot be deemed sufficient, while the number admitted is also too large. Two or three others in different parts of the nation, under the best masters that could be found, are certainly wanted: and the public liberality of the Society would be happily employed to encourage them. Thus, and from more liberal zeal to impart instruction among parents at home, we may hope to see religious improvement gradually advancing, and the cause of the blessed Gospel grow.

As matters now stand, where there is not absolute stagnation, the current is feeble and irregular. A warm female piety, frequently with very inadequate talents, and adapted to movements of a petty enthusiasm, appears to take the lead in many places, where proper knowledge and genuine abilities should be found. Thus an original principle of gospel liberty seems to have been nursed up, by credulity and indiscretion, into a superfluity of exception to the general order of Providence, and to the extension of general weakness and disadvantage to the Society. Such instruments as we now allude to, obtain, we fear, a too easy sanction for travelling abroad into distant counties, and even countries, too lightly leaving the domestic duties of their families; as though the spread of the gospel beyond sea depended on their setting a doubtful, and even an enthusiastic example!—It is a rule held sacred among serious persons of some

other Societies, that *two positive and incompatible duties cannot exist together*. This seems to be a safe and admirable check against improper enthusiasm; and may be worthy of some serious regard among *us*, as to the matter in question. Instances are not wanting in the modern history of our Society, in which a close adherence to such a rule might have prevented unpleasant and even unhappy effects in families. And the present state of the Society is a standing proof how ineffectual to its general prosperity its feeble system of ministration has proved! The real service of such persons as frequently travel in the ministry among Friends, has frequently appeared to us the more doubtful, when we have considered in what light they are often viewed by the most discerning persons of other societies, who are invited to attend our meetings. The frequent public invitations of mixed audiences, sometimes by printed hand-bills distributed through towns and cities, we cannot, in the present state of our ministry, but exceedingly regret. The parties too commonly standing forward as ministers on such occasions, for want of even moderate qualifications, seem to us in danger of injuring, instead of being likely to promote, the cause of truth. This is too evident: for, while due credit is candidly given for sincerity of intention, such has been the frequent evidence of indistinct knowledge, as to the *matter* delivered, and of weakness in the *manner* of delivery, that the smile of surprise, if not of contempt, has been commonly excited: and this is not to be seen merely among the most light and superficial part of an audience, but amongst persons the most predisposed to serious attention. Thus our boasted principle of a *free and inspired ministry*, supported as it often is at a considerable society-expence, has lost much of its weight with other societies; nor has the national fund, raised for aiding public

services, been expended, in the ministerial department, to general satisfaction among ourselves: the dissatisfaction must increase with the causes, among the more reflecting members of the body.

And here it may be seasonable to mention, that of late years considerable expense has been doubtfully incurred, on account of some particular persons from *America*, who have prolonged their stay in this country, in the character of public ministers, far beyond any evidence of propriety and of gospel service. The subject, though a delicate one, we feel it proper to advert to on this occasion, hoping it may henceforward be more closely considered. The unfavourable impressions made on young and enquiring minds, respecting the principle of an inspired ministry, and the consequent light esteem of it, which may be likely to succeed; we consider as none of the least disadvantages, resulting from such doubtful examples of loitering and indolent persons: persons who, instead of being diligently employed in discharging rightly-concerned minds, that they may return seasonably and with good repute to their own families and connexions, become apparently more attached to ease and indulgence, than accompanied by remaining proofs of religious commission.

The case of our estimable friend, and gifted sister, Hannah Barnard, we consider as wholly exempt, by its peculiarities, from the force of these general remarks. And while we lament the manner in which that case was treated *here*, we are strengthened in our disapprobation of the treatment she finally received. Prejudice, and the spirit of censure, seem to have been strongly excited against her by the intolerant tone of English proceedings, and to have had chief weight among the members of her own meeting; men who, for judgment, liberality and discretion, must long continue to rank

low, in the public estimation. The particulars of the issue of that business, when they shall come to be more fully known (perhaps from the pen of the author of the *Appeal* to the Society, relative to that subject), must furnish a standing proof of an intemperate spirit, of disgraceful ignorance, and ever-to-be-lamented bigotry! The only useful fruit that we can hope for, from such a recorded series of unchristian treatment, is, that the rising and succeeding generations of Friends, in both countries, may profit by it as a warning; that they may be led to consider thereby, the baneful tendency of such a procedure, and be guarded against the public injury of similar errors. May such be the salutary effect!

And now, beloved Friends, having thus freely addressed you on the foregoing subjects, which we recommend to your serious regard, we would add a few seasonable remarks on the alterations of *rules*, and modes of *discipline*, and of the *yearly meeting*. It was the early persuasion of our ancestors, and continues to be that of many in this day, that our Society has been aided by the assistance of a superior power, in the fixing of its rules of membership, of marriage, and of general discipline, &c. The alterations which have taken place in the written records, by abridgment and digesting into a printed volume of *extracts*, which a few years ago was supposed to be a *final* adjustment; the late revisals and new-modellings of that book of the law, and the mode of procedure in marriage (which had before been repeatedly changed), the uses of select meetings, augmentation of the powers of women's meetings; printed sanctions of writings, afterwards rejected or verbally disapproved, &c. go to a proof of more instability among the members of a spiritual body, than fully comports with their professions of divine guidance. We mention this

generally, not from upbraiding motives, but to shew by examples, how very far our Society has been from evincing the character of infallibility: variableness, and much more than the shadow of turning, have been its frequent attendants. We do not say, *less* was to have been expected, from an impartial view of the Society, as it has from time to time appeared; but we regret that so much *mutation* should have attended a Society, so highly professing the unchangeable guidance of the spirit of truth!—From the late protracted length of the yearly meeting in London, it should seem that much inconvenience of complexity has arisen from these changes; or, that a large increase of numbers in the Society, attended by the establishment of many new meetings, has occasioned an abundant increase of correspondence. But the decrease of numbers, the consolidating of monthly and quarterly meetings, in various districts, and the partial and total shutting up of many meeting-houses through the nation, on account of diminution and weakness of numbers, are known to be the facts! And in noticing these facts, we are induced to regret the narrow prohibitory rules, lately adopted, against occasionally permitting any of our meeting-houses to be used for public worship by other societies, although till very lately it was deemed not improper to accept the use of theirs!

Thus, it is to be inferred, that while the bulk and importance of the Society have greatly lessened, increased pains have been bestowed, either to prop her from falling, or to hasten her decay! We cannot but fear there has been an unhappy, though perhaps unintentional, mixture of both! It is the property of shadows to lengthen as the sun declines: and we are but too fully convinced, that though the light, the glory of true devotion, never diminishes in itself, yet the dulness and receding of those who

profess it, will produce the correspondent effect. A dry unavailing form of business, seems to have been invented and kept up, and a disposition excited to raise and agitate new difficulties of faith and policy,—as though it were possible, by such means, to balance the loss of that real dignity, which once distinguished the annual assemblies of our ancestors! With respect to *their* transactions of needful and orderly business, for the sufficient regulation of a much more numerous church, *one week* was generally found sufficient. The increased complexity of new orders and powers in women's meetings, for truly speculative purposes, make one of the prominent features of this day: and if it may not be literally said of this Society, that the glory is departed from her, yet are we forcibly reminded of the language of the prophet formerly, Is. 3. 12. "As for my people, children are their oppressors "and women rule over them: O my people, they "which lead thee, cause thee to err, and destroy "the way of thy paths." If it be possible that so much time as is now consumed, should be *necessarily* employed, by hundreds of persons, to regulate the internal affairs of a declining Society, what less can it prove, than the necessity of recurring to first principles, with an humble and earnest solicitude? It is not from the complexity, but the simple dignity of principles, that devotional bodies elevate. It is not a formal going up to an outward Jerusalem once a year, from the scattered districts of the Society; it is not from new garments and broad philacteries; from external salutations and greetings; from visiting and feasting, for a lengthened season, from house to house; that the original fervent spirit of devotion and ministry is to be regained! This must be done by a solemn recurrence to first principles, and using those means which are rational and efficacious. Other protestant so-

cieties, to whom, according to *their* conception of its nature, the gospel cause is precious, by using the means of practical edification and increase, are abundantly increasing! We profess a more spiritual call, and peculiarities more excellent than they; but what, brethren, have such boasted superiority, and our multiplied restrictions and formalities, done for us as a society? To serious minds the answer is at once humiliating and painful!

On the whole, when we consider the state of the church, to which, from various causes, she stands reduced, we cannot but earnestly recommend a suitable humility respecting her present importance. The still prevalent idea of our being a *peculiar people*, and providentially set as a light in the Christian world, the Society cannot be too cautious about considering as their *remaining* character. But while we thus feelingly admonish, we are encouraged to believe, that the divine providence is graciously over us for good, breathing the import of this language, Hos. 11. 8. "How shall I give thee "up, Ephraim?—How shall I deliver thee, Israel? "—How shall I make thee as Admah?—How "shall I set thee as Zeboim?"—And we are comfortably persuaded, that if there should arise a more happy union of desire for a truly spiritual *renovation*, the divine call, ability and promises, will yet be found effectual to such an important end. Under this impression, we are strongly reminded of that prophetic language of the Psalmist, Ps. 68. 13. "Though ye have lien among the "pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove, "covered with silver, and her feathers of yellow "gold."

Finally, beloved Friends, we salute you in much concern for a better state of things among us, more worthy of our origin, and the spirituality of our profession; more suitable to scriptural sim-

plicity of faith, and more consonant with the character of a people professing to be led and guided by the spirit of unalterable truth, and of universal benevolence! And *may the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God, and the growing Fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be with us all!* Amen.

Signed on behalf of those Brethren, wherever resident, whose hearts are united on the subjects of this Epistle, by

THEOPHILUS FREEMAN.

London,
5th Month, 1803.

Printed by W. Spilsbury, Snowhill.

THE RECORDER, VOL. I
by William Matthews, 1802

Bound in full brown leather.

When received the leather was rotten and both boards were detached. The sewing structure was sound.

Treatment: The sewing was reinforced with stabjoint endsheets of Fabriano Ingres. A 50/50 mixture of Jade 403 & methylcellulose was used against the textblock. The book was cased in celery colored buckram with a Nideggen paper label inlaid onto the spine.

Ellen Anne Owings 1985